REED

Church & State in Massachusetts

1691-1740

History

Ph. D.

1913

UNIV. OF
ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

1913
St5

CHURCH AND STATE IN MASSACHUSETTS

1691 — 1740

BY

SUSAN MARTHA REED

B. A. Mount Holyoke College, 1907

M. A. University of Illinois, 1908

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN HISTORY

IN

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1913

1913
St5

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

May 14 1913

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Susan Martha Reed

ENTITLED Church and State in Massachusetts 1691-1740.

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Ph. D.

Ernest B. Greene
In Charge of Major Work

Head of Department

Recommendation concurred in:

Lawrence M. Larson
Ernest L. Bogart
Edward P. Sherman

Committee on Final Examination

246509

CONTENTS

Chap.		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Ecclesiastical System of Provincial Massachusetts	10
III.	Opposing Elements	28
IV.	The System in Practice	45
V.	The Quakers and their Allies	93
VI.	The Church of England	170
	Conclusion	224
	Bibliography	226
	Vita	241

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/churchstateinmas00stif_0

MAINE
NEW HAMPSHIRE
MASSACHUSETTS
MIDDLESEX
SUFFOLK
BRISTOL
PLYMOUTH
BARNSTABLE
CONNECTICUT
R.I.
DISSENT IN MASSACHUSETTS 1725.
QUAKERS
BAPTISTS
ANGLICANS
QUARTERLY MEETING
MONTHLY MEETING
BAPTIST SOCIETY
EPISCOPAL CHURCH
WELLS
DOVER
YORK
KITTERY
PORTSMOUTH
ISLES OF SHOALS
STRATHAM
EXETER
SEABROOK (HAMPTON)
SALISBURY
AMESBURY
NEWBURY
HAVERHILL
IPSWICH
SALEM
MARBLEHEAD
LYNN
MEDFORD
BOSTON
HULL
BRAINTREE
SCITUATE
DEDHAM
HOPKINTON
HANOVER
MARSHFIELD
UXBRIDGE
MENDON
PEMBROKE
DUXBURY
BRIDGEWATER
ATTLEBORO
HALIFAX
TAUNTON
REHOBOTH
PROVIDENCE
FREETOWN
ROCHESTER
BARRINGTON
WARWICK
SWANSEA
BRISTOL
GREENWICH
PORTSMOUTH
TIVERTON
ACUSHNET
SANDWICH
YARMOUTH
DARTMOUTH
APPONEGANSET
FALMOUTH
NEWPORT
LITTLE COMPTON
KINGSTON
NANTUCKET

CHURCH AND STATE IN MASSACHUSETTS
1691--1740.

CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTION.

In its political and economic phases the colonial policy of the last two Stuarts was continued by their successor. William III saw, as had the Stuarts, that the best solution of the problem of imperial control was to be found in uniting and bringing more closely under the crown, governments which had shown a spirit of independence. There had appeared in Charles II's time certain indications of a desire to enforce a religious policy, parallel to the political and economic, by making the Church of England the church of the colonies. Such a measure would assist imperial control by effecting a unity of religious life parallel to the unity in general administration which it was hoped could be maintained. The continuation of such a line of action was not attempted by William, representative of Dutch protestantism and of low churchmanship. Succeeding reigns which adhered to the continued enforcement of British imperial control over the political and economic life of the colonies, were inconsistent in ecclesiastical affairs. In general the religious side of colonial policy was neglected during the one hundred years introduced by the accession of William of Orange, except under Queen Anne. If the reign of William and Mary was in this regard a disappointment to the English Church, much more so was the period of the early Georges, when the Church in its enterprises over sea received little sympathy from Walpole.

It was for this reason that the Church of England, during the

greater part of this time, found itself on almost the same footing in relation to the colonies as any one of the dissenting sects was placed. The laws which pronounced an establishment were not considered to extend to the colonies. Whatever attempts were made to advance Episcopacy in the provinces belonged not to the government but to the Church itself, working through individuals and organizations, and only on rare occasions assisted by governmental authority. In the colonies therefore the Church found itself forced into the arena without the arms which it possessed as an established church at home and facing two other religious groups, the Society of Friends and the dissenting bodies proper. In some colonies such as Virginia, where the Church of England had long existed under laws of establishment, making conditions correspond closely with those in England, this contest was less conspicuous. In others such as Pennsylvania, Maryland and Rhode Island, where the Quaker element was most vigorous, it resolved itself into a duel, each body supported by the parent organization in the mother country. In Connecticut a similar duel was fought out between Anglicans and Congregationalists, and in Massachusetts a three cornered fight took place because of the presence of numerous Quaker communities among the old towns of the "standing order".

With the exception of Roman Catholicism there were few religious movements or counter movements in England in the seventeenth century which did not have their reflection on the seaboard of New England. Founded by the two branches of English dissent, the Nonconformists and the more radical dissenters, the colonies of Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth, through the period of the civil war and the commonwealth in England, had continued to oppose Episcopacy,

keeping in close touch with authority at home. Among themselves they had maintained a unity in ecclesiastical life which banished political and religious theorists of a different stamp to the Rhode Island border. Only with the restoration came the real rupture between New England and Nonconformity at home. There was no longer the personal sympathy of the first generation which had been stimulated by the conditions in Charles I's time, neither was there the unity of common purpose which could be felt during the period of the civil war in England. From the restoration on, the Nonconformists of England and New England had diverse interests and developed in opposite directions. On the New England shore the two bodies had grown closer together and had worked out a system of church and state government which drew inspiration from both Plymouth and the Bay. At the time of the provincial charter, which joined Plymouth to its larger neighbor, the final compromise was effected and the two systems merged into one. This was the basis of Massachusetts ecclesiasticism in the eighteenth century. In the meantime the aggression of outside elements was forcing more closely together the members of the standing order. Such an element was the coming of the Quakers with the conversion to Quakerism of large numbers of persons of their own communities who had already given evidences of a varying form of theology. A little later the recognition of the Church of England worship in Boston during James II's reign helped to increase the rigidity of theological belief and ecclesiastical system which was fastening itself on the second and third generations of New England Nonconformity.

Contemporaneously with this development in Massachusetts, with which the Dissenters of England had little in common, conditions

at home were attracting their attention and giving them interests which made no appeal to New England Congregationalism. Their last close connection with New England came with the ejectment of the nonconforming ministers in Charles II's reign. In the last quarter of the seventeenth century they were stirred by ecclesiastical and theological discussion belonging to the various attempts to secure the passage of a comprehension bill, and when this had failed, after bringing out the points of variance rather than of likeness among Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists, they were almost immediately overwhelmed by the events of the early eighteenth century. From their struggle during Queen Anne's reign to oppose the Occasional Conformity and Schism acts, they were hurled into the anti-trinitarian controversy of the next quarter of a century, the latter dividing their ranks again, on new lines. From all these contests New England Congregationalism was well nigh free, and in proportion to this freedom it hardened and narrowed, drawing apart and holding little in common with the constantly developing dissent of England.

New England Nonconformity was moreover freed from governmental opposition to the establishment of its system by the accession of William and Mary. Though the king was disappointed in the failure of the comprehension bill and able to do no better for the English dissenters than the toleration act, the treatment which his government gave the Massachusetts Bay Province in ecclesiastical affairs shows to what extent sympathy came from the Dutch Protestant king. The new charter, a work of Increase Mather under the authority of William, announced liberty of conscience to all Christians except Roman Catholics, and the next few years saw the allow-

ance by the king in council of the Massachusetts legislation which practically renewed the ecclesiastical system of the seventeenth century. While continuing the methods of the Stuarts in dealing with political and economic problems in New England William went only so far with the corresponding ecclesiastical problem as to attempt the suppression of religious factions in the legislative assembly.

While the royal authority failed to carry out the plan of promoting the Church in the colonies, the Church itself, through the effort of individuals and organizations , turned to the matter with zeal. Beginning with the efforts of the Bishop of London, acting as diocesan of the colonies, and continued by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge under the influence of Dr. Bray, the work culminated in the formation of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel which was to devote itself entirely to the colonies beyond the seas. It was in the reign following William's, when the Queen's influence was cast on the side of the society, that it received its grestest impetus.

Outside of the Anglican Church English protestantism at the opening of the eighteenth century was divided between the two large groups of the Quakers and the Dissenters proper, the latter including Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists, three sects which in spite of repeated efforts, had found it difficult to effect any real union. They had passed their period of increase at the expense of the Church of England, and were at this time not only at odds with one another but were torn with religious controversy, each within itself. The Arian movement was at work in the ranks of all three, while the two less numerous and influential, as

well as more rigid sects, the Congregationalists and Baptists, were looking upon the more favored and more liberal Presbyterians with distrust. Quite different was the case of the Quakers who having passed the period of active persecution were living like the other dissenters under the toleration act and had secured other legislation in their favor. In wealth, numbers and political power they exercised at this time an influence second only to that of the established church. Their political power was in large measure to be traced to their strongly centralized organization over which the London Yearly Meeting exercised supreme authority. Difficulties carried by weekly and monthly meetings to this central body were turned over by it to the Meeting for Sufferings which in frequent sittings considered all subjects with due care and took active measures for redress. Through numerous wealthy and prominent members who were close to the government in William's reign, the ear of authority was reached with little difficulty. In Quakerism the Anglican Church of the late seventeenth century saw its most dangerous adversary, and in the Quaker doctrine read a statement of belief which it looked upon as Non-Christian and attacked accordingly. The conversion of the Quakers of England was a purpose of the S.P.C.K. while work among the Quakers in the colonies was an important object of the S.P.G.

The duel between the Anglicans and the Quakers in the colonies, each backed by a powerful influence at home, the London Meeting and the English Church, became the leading feature of the ecclesiastical situation in America in the early eighteenth century. The period saw the culmination of the numerical strength of Quakerism as well as the most important strides taken by the Church of England

in the colonies between the restoration and the Declaration of Independence. Successful attempts were made to establish Episcopacy legally in several colonies, and Anglican churches, the results of missionary enterprise, grew up in the whole line of coast provinces from Maine to South Carolina.

While the Nonconformists were relatively stronger in the colonies than in England, they were as in the mother country, both in numbers and influence, less important than the Society of Friends. The various sects had almost no support from the parent groups at home and were even more disunited than they. The Baptists indeed were, in the colonies, more closely allied with the Quakers than with either Congregationalists or Presbyterians, their insistence upon the separation of church and state forming an important part of their platform, a condition which placed them at odds with the establishments of Massachusetts and Connecticut. The Presbyterians were at this time in no great numbers in the colonies as the coming of the Scotch Irish belonged to a later period. Presbyterians who reached New England were, with a few exceptions absorbed by the Congregational churches in existence there. These churches which formed the establishments of Massachusetts and Connecticut had drifted so far from any corresponding group in England that they were looked upon very unsympathetically by English Nonconformists, especially for the extremes in ecclesiastical legislation in both colonies. In spite of this rift the strength of New England Nonconformity was such that Quakerism made but slight inroads into Connecticut and in Massachusetts was relegated to the border counties. It was for this reason that the Church of England in its planting in Connecticut found itself facing, not the Quakers, but

only the strongly established Congregational system. Massachusetts on the other hand offers the unique case of a three cornered combat in which the two bodies possessing vigorous backing at home and triumphing, the one or the other, through the middle and southern colonies, were here outnumbered and long defied. Their adversaries, while not supported by any parent group abroad were so united and so rigid that any concessions were long denied.

In the struggle for religious liberty the Quakers were the first to enter the conflict, wording appeals to the governor and to the Friends of London before the S.P.G. had even been organized. They were regularly supported by the Baptist churches of the province but the assistance thus given them was meagre, as the latter were a small sect in New England until after the Great Awakening. The success which the Friends began to meet in the reigns of the first two Georges was largely due to the political influence of the Quaker body in London which made every effort to gain favor for the meetings of New England.

The Anglican invasion of Massachusetts, beginning with the founding of the S.P.G., and given an added impulse by the Queen's favor in subsequent years, met certain reverses after her death. As a church society the S.P.G. found itself less well supported by Hanoverian Lutheranism than by the high church sympathies of Queen Anne. Whig politics likewise, with Walpole's desire to placate the Nonconformists as a strong wing of the Whig party, turned aside the attacks made by the provincial Churchmen upon Massachusetts ecclesiastical law. The result was that the acts of religious toleration passed in Massachusetts for the benefit of Anglicans, in the second quarter of the eighteenth century, came slowly and were the result of repeated and insistent efforts.

This progress toward religious liberty, slow as it was, was aided by the fact that New England was at a low point in spiritual vitality during this time which immediately preceded the Great Awakening. Such a condition, while it was at first inclined to rear a structure of ecclesiasticism in inverse ratio to its possession of deep religious feeling, had no real power to resist external attacks upon such a system.

The nature of that structure and an account of the hostile attempts made upon it by outside forces will be traced in the following chapters. As a study of institutions some emphasis is placed upon the actual construction of the Massachusetts church-town at the highest point of its development and before its disintegration began. As a study of English influence upon colonial life some attention is paid to the religious and political forces at work in England, to indicate to what extent the events which occurred were or were not a part of religious colonial policy.

CHAPTER II.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEM OF PROVINCIAL MASSACHUSETTS.

The Massachusetts ecclesiastical system of the eighteenth century was based on the Province charter of the year 1691, and yet in this document no trace of church establishment appears. It merely stated that "for the greater Ease and Encouragement of Our Loveing Subjects Inhabiting our said Province or Territory of the Massachusetts Bay and of such as shall come to Inhabit there Wee doe by these presents for us Our heires and Successors Grant Establish and Ordaine that for ever hereafter there shall be a liberty of Conscience allowed in the Worshipp of God to all Christians (Except Papists) Inhabiting or which shall Inhabit or be Resident within our said Province or Territory."[1] Upon the question of what was to be understood by "liberty of Conscience---in the Worshipp of God" there was immediate discussion and disagreement. On the one hand were the views of the Mathers and of the hierarchy which soon found expression in the laws for maintaining religion; on the other hand the more liberal interpretation by the dissenters. "Your Religion is secured to you," announced the elder Mather in the election sermon of 1693. "Now you need not fear being sent to Prison (as some of you were under a late Covernment) because you scruple Swearing by a Book. You may Worship God in the greatest Purity, and no one may disturb you. If you set apart Daies for Solemn Praier or Praises, as the Divine Providence may call thereunto, you need not fear being interrupted or Obstructed therein as it was here six years ago. You may by Laws not only Protect, but encourage that Religion which is the General Profession of the Country."[2] "Religion is forever secured," repeated his son,

"a righteous and generous liberty of conscience established. And the General Assembly may, by their acts, give a distinguishing encouragement unto that religion which is the general profession of the inhabitants."[3] The interpretation therefore which the standing order in Massachusetts put upon this much debated clause in the new charter concerned their own relation to the crown and to the English church and did not take into consideration a possible point of view among their dissenting sects. The latter however, were not slow in applying the phrase to their own circumstances, as soon as new legislation began to put into execution the old and well established church-state system.

The opposite view is presented repeatedly in the appeals to authority which the dissenting sects made during the whole of the provincial period. A Quaker paper of 1702 begged for"a Liberty of Conscience in the Exercise of Religion as a Priviledge granted by their Majestyes Charter,"[4] and the later petitions to provincial assembly and to the crown repeated over and over the same idea. The position is carefully taken in an elaborate representation to Her Majesty by the Baptists of Pehoboth in 1715. "Whereas King Charles the Second of happy memory. When Complaint was made unto his sacred Majestie of the Cruell abuses that his Loyall subjects met with all in the Massathusetts Collony in New England, Namely. the Baptists, and the Quakers, and that from the Independant and Presbiterian parties, and that upon the Account of Religion, Some they Severely fined, some weer Cruelly punished, and put to Death, he Did quickly put a Stop to their Tirannie and Enlarged the Libertye of his poor Distressed subjects, to his Immortall honour, Granting Libertye of Conscience in the Worship of god to all his

good Subjects in this Province which we Enjoyed allsoe in the Reign of King James the Second, and Confirmed by King William the third and Queen Mary, By Charter for the Better Encouragein of there good Subjects in New England, and when your Sacred Majestie Came to the throne you was pleased to Indulge the tender consciences of your good and Loyall subjects in this Province, for which we owe all true Allegiance to the Church of England for Ever, Yett notwithstanding it has been the Practice of many towns within this Province, and Still is to Rate and make Distress Upon the Estates of men whoe Differr in Point of Worship, as the Case is with us in this town of Rehoboth."[5] Many years laterBackus, in critical comment on Cotton Mather, asserts that for the General Assembly to "give a distinguishing encouragement" unto a certain form of religion is nothing less than to "empower some to judge for others about worship, and to enforce their judgments with the sword; which is the root of the worst persecutions in the world."[6]

These two conflicting opinions in regard to the meaning of the charter and the rights of the dissenting sects in the province became the basis of the struggle which continued through a large part of the eighteenth century.

In pursuance of the Mather theory that laws should be passed for the encouragement of that form of religion which received popular favor, the General Court on the 17th of June, 1692, began to put once more into operation the system of financial support for the orthodox ministers of the towns which, as far as it was a matter regulated by the central authority, had recently lapsed. "Whereas," ran the preamble, "several taxes or assessments, necessary for the support of the ministry and other public charges

arising in the several counties and towns within this province, have been laid upon the inhabitants, and orderly committed to the constables or collectors by the selectmen or assessors in the several towns --- and in many places remains uncollected," it was ordered that the constables and collectors be required to collect all such rates and pay them to the county treasurer in each county or the selectmen in the town where they were made before the 10th of the following December. In any county or town where such taxes had been agreed on, but not assessed, the selectmen of the several towns were ordered to make such rates and commit them to the constables to be collected in the same manner.[7]

Toward the end of the same year came the first of the acts "for the settlement and support of ministers and schoolmasters" under the provincial government but differing only slightly from the previous legislation on the subject. Each town in the province was ordered to take due care to be provided with an "able, learned orthodox minister or ministers, of good conversation," the same to be suitably maintained by the inhabitants of the town. If the inhabitants of a town failed to make a contract, then upon complaint to the quarter sessions of the peace for the county, the latter was empowered "to order a competent allowance unto such minister according to the estate and the ability of the town; the same to be assessed upon the inhabitants by warrant from the court, directed to the selectmen" who were then to assess the same and cause it to be levied by the constables. The act further provided that in case a town was without a minister for six months the court of quarter sessions should order such town to provide themselves immediately and in case they failed to do so the court should itself procure and settle a minister there "and order the

charge thereof and of such ministers maintainance to be levied upon the inhabitants of such town." So far no new theory was involved but in the fourth section appeared a new principle. Under the colonial government it had been customary for the members of a church to elect the man who should become their minister, but as church members only could become freemen and hence voters in town affairs, this was practically equivalent to the election of a minister by the town in those towns of the province which still had but one church. That it was looked upon in this way is probable from the fact that the new law ordered that a minister should be chosen by the major part of the inhabitants of a town in town meeting; and that the whole town should then be obliged to pay towards his settlement and maintenance.[8] Immediately there arose a difficulty for the new charter had done away with the old church membership qualification for voting and had substituted a property basis which, now applied, meant that a far larger group of people[9] than the members of a church would be selecting its minister. Further than this it failed to satisfy the conditions existing when there was more than one church in a town, particularly true of Boston where even the provision in regard to maintenance was a dead-letter because of the well established method of voluntary contributions[10] to which the Boston churches were accustomed.

Before dissatisfaction with these provisions had caused any change in legislation, the General Court continued its supervision of ministerial support in an act for regulating townships and town officers. It was enacted (16 November, 1692) that the selectmen or townsmen should assess the inhabitants and others resident of a town and the lands and estates lying within its bounds to all town

charges ordered by the inhabitants in town-meeting "for the maintenance and support of the ministry, schools, the poor, and for the defraying of other necessary charges arising within the said town," the constable or constables thereupon to levy and collect such assessments, "and to make distress upon all such [as] [who] shall [neglect or] refuse to make payment. And for want of goods or chattels whereon to make distress, to seize the person and commit him to the common goal of the county, there to remain until he pay the sum upon him assessed as aforesaid,unless the same, or any part thereof, upon application made unto the quarter sessions, shall be abated." A penalty of five pounds was then declared for refusing to take the cath when duly chosen to serve in the office of constable, and in case the defective constable refused to pay this fine, it was to be levied by distress and sale of his goods, the overplus returned "if any be".[11]

Meanwhile the unsatisfactory provisions of the act for the settlement and support of ministers was causing annoyance, and to dispel it, on February17,1693, was passed an act to explain and alter some of its clauses. It repealed the fourth section and in its stead gave each church power to choose its own minister with the restriction that this act of the church, to be valid, must be concurred in by "the major part of such inhabitants as do there usually attend on the publick worship of God, and are by law duly qualified for voting in town affairs."[12] The clause allowing for his settlement and support was made more explicit, ordering that whether it be an incorporated town or merely a "part of a town, or a place limited by law for upholding the publick worship of God, all the inhabitants, and rateable estates lying within"it should be obliged to

pay in proportion. In the case of Boston an exception was made in both of these matters and this town was allowed to continue its "accustomed method and practice", each church responsible for the choice of its minister and his support dependent upon the voluntary contributions of its adherents. In dealing with defective towns the second law was more definite than the first and went farther. Where a town neglected its duty in regard to maintenance of the ministry, the court of quarter sessions, upon complaint, should summon the selectmen, or other assessors, and impose a fine upon them "not exceeding forty shillings each person for the first offense; and upon a second conviction of such neglect to impose a fine of four pounds upon each person; and the like sum of four pounds for every after conviction; such fines to be levied by distress and sale of the offender's goods (returning the overplus if any be)."[13] Such definite measures as these were the result of new conditions created by the provisions of the province charter. With the merging of Plymouth Colony in Massachusetts there came under the Boston government three new counties in each one of which were towns that for thirty years had been establishing independent religious services recognized by their own town government and resisting the Plymouth General Court. To provide against this state of affairs among the Baptists and Quakers of Buzzards Bay, Cape Cod and the Rhode Island border became the chief purpose of the ecclesiastical legislation of Massachusetts for the next thirty-five years.

The law just quoted went into effect in the winter of 1693. One year from the following May, at the time of meeting of the general assembly of Massachusetts Bay, when, as was customary, the

ministers of the province were assembled in their annual convention at Boston,[14] they framed a memorial to present to the General Court describing certain difficulties which some of their number were experiencing under the existing legislation. "Inasmuch as destitute Churches are plunged into Extreame Difficultys," ran this memorial,"in their Election & settlement of Ministers by ye Opposition wc their Acts find from ye Non-concurrence of ye other Inhabitants in their Towns, It is requested that ye Late Act of ye Generall Court referring thereunto, may be Explained, with an Additional Clause, Declaring, what shall bee done by Churches, In Case ye other Inhabitants in a Towne Oppose their Acts in ye Calling of a Minister, without giving Satisfactory Reasons for their Non-concurrence." It was suggested that the inhabitants of the town might in such a case call a council of representatives from several other churches who should consider the question under discussion, and in case of agreement with church rather than town could annul the vote of the town meeting. The charges arising from the entertainment of such a council should by paid by a levy upon the whole town.[15] No law to this effect was passed in this session but in the following year the ministers again reminded the court of the "many parts of the Countrywhich from year to year live without any settled Ministry," and urged that "This Hona Court would take it into their Consideration whether a Committee may not be appointed --- to Tender fit Methods for the Establishment of the Christian Religion in those places."[16] The Court now took action. On June 13, 1695 the substance of the memorial of 1694 became law insofar as it provided for the calling of a council "consisting of the elders andmessengers of three or five neighboring churches" in case of the

non-concurrence in the church's act by the town.[17] It did however suggest the possibility of this council's favoring the town rather than the church's vote by ordering that in this case the church should "proceed to the election of another minister," and no action was taken concerning the expenses of the council.[18]

Two years later came a law regarding town rates which rounded out this early legislation dealing with the settlement and support of the ministry. Certain constables and collectors of town rates proving defective and negligent of duty, it was enacted that in case they failed to issue their accounts with the town treasurer by the time prefixed in their warrants, they should be "lyable to the action or suite of the treasurer" of the town who might "sue for and recover all such rates and assessments, or any arrears thereof, of and from those constables or collectors."[19]

From the foregoing laws may be outlined briefly the workings of the Massachusetts ecclesiastical system at the beginning of the provincial period. Three governmental bodies were concerned with the church as related to the state; the town meeting, the court of quarter sessions of the county and the Massachusetts General Court. The legislative body passed the ecclesiastical laws ordering that each town should be provided with a minister and that he should be supported by public taxation in that town, his salary to be collected by the constable or collector with the other town rates. By the General Court also the Court of Quarter Sessions was made responsible that these laws were put into execution. Towns which failed to supply themselves with ministers were to be supplied and selectmen or assessors who failed to assess the rates might by prosecuted by this court. Lastly the town itself played

an important part in this system, for the choice of the minister, made by the church, was not valid until ratified in town meeting.

The laws of 1693 and 1695 offered a clear program for dealing with normal towns in their relation to church, minister and support of religious worship. There was however already appearing that undercurrent of determination to manage effectively the communities where a large number of dissenters to the standing order prevented a willing support of the system. Trouble with them continued and an act of 1702 for the first time stated the case by saying that "in some few towns and districts within this province, divers of the inhabitants are Quakers, and other irreligious persons averse and opposite to the publick worship of God, and to a learned orthodox ministry, and find out ways to elude the laws provided for the support of such, and prevent the good intentions thereof, to the encouragement of irreligion and profaneness." The law of1692 for the fining of delinquent selectmen or assessors was now reenacted with the further provision that the court of general sessions might in their places appoint "three or more sufficient freeholders within the same county, to assess and apportion the sum agreed or set for the yearly support and maintenance of such minister," which would then be passed with a warrant for its collection by two justices of the peace to the constables of the town to collect the amount and pay to the minister, the constables who failed of a due execution of such warrant to "incur the like pains, penalties and forfeitures as for not collecting and paying in any other rate or assessment to them committed." The court of general sessions was also to order a recompense to the assessors for this purpose appointed, out of the fines set upon the delinquent selectmen or as-

sessors, the remainder to go to the county.[20]

For the next few years following this enactment the Court of General Sessions for Bristol County found such calm resistance to this legislation in the Quaker towns of Dartmouth and Tiverton that the legislative body of the province was forced to come to its aid with the act of November 14,1706. The justices of the general sessions of the peace were ordered, at the opening of their court to give special charge to the grand jury to make presentment of all towns and districts within the county destitute of a minister or failing to provide for his support, and upon such presentment vigorously to put in execution the laws relating to neglects of this kind. If their orders were then eluded by the towns concerned the justices were to make report of their proceedings at the next meeting of the general court. Upon receipt of this report the general court of the province should take upon itself the care of securing a minister for such town or district, and provide for his maintenance. The course by which the latter was to be obtained carried the prerogative of the provincial government in ecclesiastical matters to the highest point which it ever dared assume. It was to add so much to the proportion of such town or district in the public taxes as might be deemed sufficient for that end, these additional sums to be assessed, collected and paid into the public treasury, together with the other public taxes, to be drawn out by warrant from the governor by and with the advice and consent of the council and duly paid to the minister for whom it was laid.[21] On December 20, 1715 this law was reenacted with the further provision that the general assembly in procuring a minister for a destitute town or precinct should have him first recommended

by three or more settled ordained ministers.[22] This law was re-enacted July 5,1722.[23]

In the meantime a succession of enactments dealing with the assessing and collecting of town taxes, especially where more than one precinct made up the town, modified the methods by which the minister's rate was gathered. The privileges and rights of the "precinct" as a distinct church-state were rapidly becoming crystalized. In 1702 such a district or precinct was empowered to appoint a clerk (corresponding to town-clerk), and separate assessors for raising a maintenance for its own minister, as well as to make out a warrant "in form as by law prescribed for town rates or assessments, directed to the constables of the town or district, for the collecting and levying of the same." In case the assessors so appointed refused or neglected to perform their duty the selectmen of the town from which such a district or precinct was set off were required to assess the inhabitants of the sum set for the maintenance of the minister thereof.[24] This law, extending only to the sums agreed on for the support of the ministry, was extended in 1718 so as to include charges for the building and repairing of meeting-houses.[25]

The existence of assessors apart from the selectmen was arranged by law, for the assessing of the province rate, as early as 1700,[26] and in 1707 they were ordered to assess county and town taxes as well, the duties of the selectmen becoming thus limited. Each town was also given option in the choice of a collector distinct from the constable to collect town and county charges as he already gathered the country rate.[27] In 1710 the idea was repeated more definitely, though still made optional, and was ap-

plied to precincts as well as towns.[28] The reenactment of this law in 1720 included a penalty for failure to serve. Anyone who refused to accept this unsought office or neglected to take the oath was to be fined three pounds, and if he refused to pay his fine he was to suffer the same prosecution as one refusing to serve in the office of constable.[29]

Such is a brief outline of the legislation of the early Massachusetts Bay province relating to the state church and its maintenance. While its chief principle remained in force for over a hundred years longer, its boldest claim was broken down at the beginning of the second quarter of the eighteenth century by causes already at work. A study of the opposing elements in the ecclesiastical life of provincial Massachusetts will throw light on the laws above enumerated and will explain the changes which came about in the second period.

NOTES.

1. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 14.

2. I. Mather, The Great Blessing of Primitive Counsellours, 21.

3. C. Mather, Parentator, 141.

4. Bristol Sessions, I, 38.

5. "Representation from the Baptists of Rehoboth," 1 Jan. 1714/15, S.P.G.Papers, BI, NO. 169.

6. Backus, Baptists, I, 446.

7. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 28.

8. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 62.

9. Backus, Baptists, I, 448; In "The Present State of New England" Randolph writes, "The Ministers in Boston are paid by a weekly Collection made in the several Congregations by the Elders, who give the Ministers what they think fitt, but in other Towns they have a settled maintenance by a rate laid upon every Inhabitant, & houses are provided for them." Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 6. "In some Churches, the Salary of the Minister is raised by a Voluntary contribution; especially in populous Places, and where many Strangers resort." C.Mather, Ratio Disciplinae, 20.

10. "That the world would soon have power over the church." Isaac Backus to Jedediah Morse, 9Mar. 1791, Backus Papers, Port.42. Cf. the Mass. State Constitution of 1780 which again introduced this method thereby causing difficulties at the time of the Unitarian movement which hastened the separation of church and state.

11. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 66.

12. More simply this expression might read "the majority of the townsmen qualified to vote in town meeting," for it was in

town meeting that the matter was decided. By "Such inhabitants as do there usuallyattend" is meant the persons who are included in the precinct, whether church members or not, and who would be expected to attend at that meeting. Nowhere is the exact situation, when finally developed, more clearly stated than in Ratio Disciplinae, 15--16. Mather here says that after the church members have voted to call a certain minister, they "have a Meeting with the other Inhabitants of their Neighborhood, who are not yet arrived into the State of Communicants; When they do all together put it unto the Vote, Whether they have no Objection against the Choice of Mr. A.B. to be the Minister of the Place; but shall concurr, to support him in the Exercise of his Ministry.

Except the Major.-Part of the Inhabitants (inclusive of the Communicants) do agree to this latter Vote, the Act of the Church, does not in the Law, make the whole Taxable in the Maintenance of the Minister, which the Church doth chuse."

13. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 102; Backus, Baptists, I, 448.

14. Walker, Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, 467--469; Mather, Ratio Disciplinae, 176, 177.

15. Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 537.

16. Mass. Archives, XI, 90.

17. "In Case of a Difference between the Church and the Inhabitants on this Occasion," Mather writes, "the Law provides the Remedy of a Council, from three NeighbourChurches, to decide, Whether the Inhabitants ought to acquiesce in the Choice, wherein the Church has gone before them.

Tho' the Law of the Place, about the Chusing and Settling of a Minister, (which has had the Royal Sanction) be a very wholesome

Law, and have much of the Gospel in it; yet there grows too much upon the Inhabitants, who are not yet come into the Communion of the Churches, a Disposition to supersede it, and over-rule it; Many People would not allow the Church any Priviledge to go before them, in the Choice of a Pastor. The Clamour is, We must maintain him!"

Mather next quotes, "Some of our Divines", who say, "'A Body of Christians, Associated for all the Ordinances of the Gospel, are a CHURCH of our Glorious LORD, which have among other precious Priviledges, a RIGHT from HIM, To chuse their own Pastors.

***

To introduce a Practice in the Choice of a Pastor, which, being followed, may soon bring a Pastor to be chosen for a Church, which few, yea, none of the Church have ever Voted for, would be to Betray and even Destroy a most Valuable RIGHT, that such a Society has a Claim unto, and many Evil Consequences are to be expected from it.

Nevertheless a CHURCH, in the Exercise of its RIGHT, ought in all possible Ways, consistent therewithal, to consult the Edification and Satisfaction of their Neighbours; especially of those, on whose Assistance, to carry on their Affairs, they may have much Dependence.

The Church ought so to manage their Choice, that, if the Neighbourshave any just Dissatisfaction, all the Respect, required by Scripture, Reason, and Cratitude, may be paid unto it.'"

Mather finally adds, "To express the Condescention, in the close of these Conclusions, the Churches, do sometimes, by their Vote, make a Nomination of Three or Four Candidates; For every One

of which the Majority of the Brethren have so Voted, that whomsoever of these the Choice falls upon, it may still be said, The Church has Chosen him. And then they bring this Nomination unto the other Inhabitants, to join with them in a Vote, that shall determine, which of them shall be the Man." Ratio Disciplinae, 16--18.

18. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 216; Backus, Baptists, I, 455.

19. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 276.

20. Ibid, I, 505. An unsuccessful attempt was made by the Bishop of London to secure the disallowance of this act by the crown. Ibid, I, 509.

21. Ibid, I, 595.

22. Ibid, II, 26; Backus, Baptists, I, 482.

23. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 243.

24. Ibid, I, 505.

25. Ibid, II, 99, ch.1, 19 June, 1718; Backus, Baptists, I, 499.

26. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 406, ch.26, 20 Mar. 1700.

27. Ibid, I, 606, ch.2, 11 June 1707. The ministry rate seems to have been assessed separately under ordinary circumstances, "But," said Mather, "Where Quakerism is troublesome, some Towns are so wise to involve the Salary of the Ministry in a general Rate for all Town Charges, and so the Cavils of those, who would else refuse to pay the Rate for the Ministry, are obviated." Ratio Disciplinae, 22. "They have the Year past brought in another of their Ministers into thistown of Rehoboth wherein we Dwell and have Rated us to him allso mixing up both his and their other ministers Rate with the town Debts." Representation from the Baptists of Rehoboth, 1 Jan. 1714/15, S.P.G. Papers, BI, No. 169.

28. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 653, ch.5, 28 June 1710.

29. Ibid, II, 181, ch.6, 29 Nov. 1720.

CHAPTER III.

OPPOSING ELEMENTS.

The New England of 1700 had to a certain extent lost the homogeneity which in the period of settlement had been possessed by the two larger colonies. In religious matters its inhabitants represented a fair sweep of opinion although as yet they were all alike dissenters to the Church of England except the small body of worshippers at King's Chapel in Boston.[1] Rhode Island, extending toleration, as it had from the first, to all sects, and hence including several thousand persons of various creeds, was under a Quaker government,[2] the prestige which this fact gave to the sect reaching well beyond its own borders. While Rhode Island had marched steadily onward in its theory of religious liberty, the case of Connecticut represented the opposite extreme. Here the strictness of early Calvinism had been modified far less than in Massachusetts Bay and though various intruders had gained a foothold they failed to thrive as in various other parts of New England.[3] Between these two positions Massachusetts was maintaining herself in a way that could not fail to become increasingly difficult. One problem had been presented to her by the annexation of New Hampshire and Maine towns which were communities of a strikingly different character from those reared under her own theocratic system. In them were settled very many persons who were primarily interested in trade and commerce and careless of her dearest theories in regard to church and state. These people, though a menace to theocratic government, were at least neutral regarding the spread of other denominations. With the merging of Plymouth Col-

ony in Massachusetts, a far more difficult problem was offered by the presence of a few Baptist churches and a number of Quaker communities which had not been effectively dealt with by the Plymouth Court, far more tolerant and less aggressive as it was than the Assembly of the old Bay Colony.

Massachusetts, at the time which we are considering, including Maine and Plymouth, was made up of about eighty villages, scattered all the way from the fishing communities of the Maine Coast, Falmouth and Scarborough, Wells, York and Kittery, to the settlements on the islands of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket. Passing over a fair sized section of rough hill country in the present county of Worcester, it had also planted a number of promising towns in the Connecticut valley, settled from farther down the river. Beginning with Springfield these had spread up the Connecticut and its branches until Northampton, Hadley, Hatfield, Deerfield and Westfield were all prosperous farming hamlets, forming the county of Hampshire. Just below the New Hampshire border lay the towns of Essex county, some of the earliest settled communities in the colony, yet sharing many of the same frontier and trading interests as their neighbors to the northward. Here were the coast towns of Salem, Gloucester and Marblehead and the exposed villages of Haverhill, Andover, Amesbury and Salisbury.[4] Boston was the center of the thickly populated towns of Suffolk and Middlesex counties, the former including the capital and the old towns to the southward, Roxbury, Dorchester and Milton, and farther toward Plymouth the early settlements of Weymouth and Braintree.[5] Middlesex County, in covering a much larger area, contained not only some of the older towns in the province, such as Cambridge, Charlestown,

Newton and Watertown, but also included another group of frontier communities requiring garrisons during the Indian Wars. Among these were Dunstable, Groton, Lancaster and Oxford.[6]

Of the three new counties which Plymouth had recently contributed Plymouth County itself represented the town of Plymouth, its neighbor Scituate, the Quaker communities of Duxbury and Marshfield, and the town of Bridgewater. The broad sand dunes of Barnstable County boasted the Cape Cod villages of Barnstable, Eastham, Sandwich and Yarmouth, and the County of Bristol was made up of the six thriving towns of Taunton, Rehoboth and Swansea, Dartmouth, Little Compton and Bristol, with the less vigorous Freetown, Tiverton and Attleborough.[7]

In many of the frontier villages and near some of the older towns as well were scattered numerous plantations of Indians whose conversion had early been a matter of serious importance to the colony and later to the province. There were a number of native Indian preachers, the ministersof the towns were likewise interested in visiting and preaching among them,[8] and the General Court was taking measures for their evangelization.[9]

Of the organized towns of the province none lacked its regular minister except an occasional frontier community or the old settlements of Bristol County which were of a spirit definitely hostile to the purposes of the standing order.

The situation in the town of Boston at the beginning of the eighteenth century was not typical of the church life of the province. There were in Boston in 1700 four Congregational Churches, the old First, the Second, under the direction of the Mathers, the South Church under Mr. Willard, and the Brattle Street Church which

because it had been recently founded on a slightly broader basis of creed and platform was still looked upon askance by the other churches.[10] The voluntary method of contributing to the maintenance of the minister had very early separated church and state in the chief town of the colony, so far as this phase of the matter was concerned. Further than this the presence of three "dissenting meetings" in this town materially changed the effect which a uniformity in creed and service would have produced.[11] The society of the French Protestants organized in Boston in 1687 had little to do with the result as the Calvinism of the Huguenots was sufficiently close to that of New England to make the Massachusetts ministers unusually cordial. There was even some special legislation in their favor and some definite financial support.[12] It was by the three "dissenting sects" of Anabaptists, Anglicans and Quakers that the innovations were made.

Of these it was the Church of England that first received recognition and permission to build a church in Boston. Orders came from Charles II to the Massachusetts authorities that the right of using the Book of Common Prayer should be denied to no one, and an Episcopal clergyman was secured for the church of Boston through Randolph's influence, reaching the town May 16, 1686. A building was begun soon after and though it suffered in the revolution of 1689 was soon after open again, and represented a well recognized organization by the end of the century.

The first Baptist Church of Boston though organized as early as 1665 was so strenuously opposed that it had no meeting house for many years. By the close of the century however the body had secured toleration and was more fortunate than the Anglican society

in its freedom from political entanglement.[13]

Toward Quakers the change of attitude in Boston had progressed even more rapidly than toward the other groups of intruders. In forty years they had passed from violent persecution, meted out to them at their first coming, to the possession of a brick meeting house, and were no longer in general odium.[14]

In 1700 then Boston had four churches of the standing order, a French Protestant congregation, a Baptist Church, a Quaker meeting and King's Chapel. Each one of them was independent financially except for the missionary help which had been given to the Huguenots, the Congregational churches maintaining themselves exactly as the Baptists were forced to do.

If Boston was non-characteristic of the province at large in its method of church support it was essentially unrepresentative of the country towns in its inclusion of four recognized sects within a single township. While Quakerism and Baptist doctrines were present in various sections of the province and appeared side by side in several places, yet in those districts where they were strongest the standing order was comparatively inconspicuous. Moreover there was outside of the Anglican congregation in Boston not a single Episcopal church in all Massachusetts as early as 1700.[15] King's Chapel itself was an outgrowth of the royal prerogative in Boston. Outside of the chief town of the province Episcopacy had so little reason for existence that there was no attempt to introduce it until the founding of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in the following year, and even under its nourishing care the Church in Massachusetts continued to be a foreign plant.

On the other hand the two religious bodies with which the

standing order first came in conflict expanded with the natural reaction to the strictness of seventeenth century Calvinism. Their "heretical" doctrines needed little stimulus from foreign sources and spread through Massachusetts with astonishing speed, dwelling under the surface at first and then asserting themselves, dividing communities, causing migrations.[16] To such ideas the founding of Rhode Island was due in part while within the Plymouth government, which was far less rigid in certain matters than the Bay Colony, were several regions which became the resort of refugees from Massachusetts. Even in the latter Salem was early harboring persons of the "seeker" type, the one region within the boundaries of the old colony where they persisted, though never flourishing here as in the Rhode Island region.

Upon such ground as this fell the seeds of Quakerism when the first members of the new society reached New England in 1656 and 1657, and though suffering banishment, persecution and finally even death, persisted in planting the doctrine which was to be the greatest foe to New England orthodoxy for almost a century.

Between the coming of the Quakers and the beginning of the provincial government when an extended boundary, a new franchise and a greater liberty of conscience modified the Massachusetts ecclesiastical system, the Society of Friends was spreading rapidly. Within the limits of the Massachusetts colony the one great center, as already indicated, was Salem and Lynn, where they had had a cordial reception; and from the north shore, itinerant preachers travelled into the Piscataqua Region which embraced the New Hampshire towns and the villages of the Maine coast.

But of all the various divisions of New England which in 1700

made up the province of Massachusetts Bay the three counties which had once formed the Plymouth Colony offered the most serious problems in the relation between Congregationalist and Friend. Two leading causes had combined to make this result inevitable, the attitude of Plymouth Colony toward dissenting sects and the close connection between this corner of the present state and the liberal towns of Rhode Island. While it is not true that the government of Plymouth was in any way friendly to the Quakers it may have been influenced in its spirit of persecution by the Boston government, and although it was severe in its restrictive laws and fined and imprisoned through a period of many years, it never suggested a death penalty.[17]

There were at the beginning of the eighteenth century three chief centers of Quakerism in this part of the province, one in each county. Plymouth town in her consistent aversion to the sect had relegated it to her neighbors on the northward, Scituate, Marshfield and Duxbury, which had numerous missionaries from Rhode Island after 1658 and were actually holding a meeting by 1660.[18]

In the county of Barnstable the two towns at the base of the cape, Sandwich and Falmouth, formed a vigorous Quaker community and were holding a meeting before 1672.[19]

Finally the third Quaker center within the boundaries of the old Plymouth Colony, embracing all the southern portion of the Massachusetts Bay Province was Bristol County. There is a certain embarrassment in treating this region as a part of Massachusetts. Including as it did in 1700 not only the townships which are still within its boundaries, but also the whole eastern shore of Narragansett Bay, it represented a greater liberality and independence along

political and religious lines than any other section of the province. These towns did indeed belong to Rhode Island in their history, their sympathy and their purposes, and were only geographically and politically a corner of Massachusetts. The history of religious development in them was parallel to that on the island. In many was a mixture of belief unified only by an insistence upon independence of authority. Others possessed a unity in doctrine best represented in the solid Quakerism of old Dartmouth. The assembly of Plymouth Colony had attempted to legislate in regard to public worship and the ministry here but was never able to enforce her orders on the town.[20]

While Bristol County was preeminently the stronghold of Massachusetts Quakerism at the beginning of the eighteenth century, to neglect the presence of the Baptists within its borders would be unjust to a sect which though more restricted at this period were destined to become the political successors of the Society of Friends. Backus recognized only two communities in which there were Baptist churches before 1700 and mentions no other before 1736.[21] While this is not perfectly accurate unless a very restricted notion is held of the qualifications of such an organization it is at the same time indicative of the small numbers of this group of dissenters in Massachusetts in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. It is again significant of the nature of Bristol County that the first Baptist society in the boundaries of the present state was in this region permitted to establish itself many years before it had any sister church except the group at Boston. This church, founded by a body of Baptists from a town in Wales who with their pastor had left home at the ejectment of the nonconforming ministers, had

found favor with certain Plymouth magistrates of liberal views and had been given the region of Swansea in which to settle. The remarkable feature in the grant of New Swansea in 1667 is that it was only a territorial grant and made no conditions as to settlement and government. Amicable relations were maintained with the orthodox members of the community, a condition made possible by the unusual catholicity of the Welch pastor, while the church stood out only for independence from governmental control. Not until he was succeeded by a man who professed more rigid Baptist views in doctrine and drew the church with him, did religious controversy between Baptist and Congregationalist begin, in time splitting the church on sectarian lines.[22]

Another early Baptist church in Bristol County was the one at Dartmouth itself, whose first teacher had found it profitable to leave the older part of the Plymouth Colony because of liberal views.[23] John Cooke had been deacon in Plymouth church for some years, but was said to have been excommunicated for causing dissention and "running into sectarian and anabaptistical principles," and leaving Plymouth finally settled in Dartmouth. A church was probably founded in the west part of the town about 1685.[24] A Baptist church is said to have been organized at Tiverton in 1684.[25]

This description of the first Quaker and Baptist meetings within the limits of the later Massachusetts Bay Province has dwelt only upon the more important centers of the propagandism. There were Baptists in all the Rhode Island border towns[26] and on the islands adjacent to Cape Cod,[27] while in small numbers they appeared in many of the towns of Plymouth Colony. There were also a few in the Piscataqua region.[28] Quakers were found between 1698 and 1705

in many of the communities to the northward such as Hampton (Amesbury)[29], Salisbury[30], Exeter[31], Jamaica[32], Newbury[33], Haverhill[34] and Strawberry Bank (Portsmouth)[35] as well as the Isles of Shoals.[36] They were living in the whole group of towns just south of Scituate,[37] in the region at the base of the cape which included Barnstable[38] and Yarmouth, on the adjacent islands[39] in all the little settlements on both sides of the Acushnet River,[40] and in even greater numbers on the shore of Narragansett Bay. It has been estimated that there were three thousand in the limits of the old Plymouth Colony[41] and that one third of the Piscataqua region was Quaker.

Before 1702 there were eight monthly meetings for business in New England. These were the meeting of Greenwich, covering the Narragansett country, of Rhode Island which included Tiverton and Little Compton, of Dartmouth, of Sandwich, including Falmouth and Yarmouth, of Pembroke which embraced Scituate, Marshfield and Duxbury, of Salem, of Hampton and of Dover. These monthly meetings were not long in grouping in the important quarterly meetings through which the great work of the Friends was done. The monthly meetings of Barnstable and Plymouth countiesformed the Sandwich and Scituate Quarterly Meeting. Dartmouth and Rhode Island Monthly Meetings joined Greenwich to them to form the Rhode Island Quarterly, while all the northern towns whether in Massachusetts proper, New Hampshire or Maine, united in 1705 to make up the Salem Quarterly Meeting[42] and to this the Boston Friends also belonged. This centralized organization was completed in the New England Yearly Meeting, assembling every June on Rhode Island, and to this gathering flocked representatives from all the Quaker towns and villages. As a business meeting its importance can hardly be overestimated,

for by making the local problems of all sections of two governments a matter for group consideration, it effected results for scattered hamlets which could never have been secured by anything but united effort. The corresponding organization in England or in Pennsylvania was no more thorough in this regard.

During the years of this development in New England Quakerism a decided change had come over that older spirit of intolerant hatred from which the Quakers still suffered even after intensity of persecution had ceased. When this attitude was discernable among the fair minded it could probably be traced to that tendency among the more ignorant of the first converts to "ranterism" for the existence of which there is much evidence.[43] Frowned on from the beginning by the better social class among the Friends it became less and less conspicuous until little ground for complaint might be found on this score.[44] On both sides of the Atlantic there was much ignorance, moreover, in regard to the real teachings of George Fox and his followers, the clergy inclined to misinterpret and the New England ministers unduly prone to misrepresent the meaning of the "inner light" and the Quaker treatment of the Bible. With increasing knowledge and better appreciation of their creed and purposes a far kinder spirit was awakened. In the meantime the industry, frugality and piety of the individual Friend began to make an impression which was bound to have visible results before many more years had elapsed.

NOTES.

1. "An Account of the State of Religion in the English Plantations in North America, by Col. Dudley, Governor of New England," Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., XIV, V.

2. Samuel Cranston, elected governor in 1698, to succeed Walter Clarke, though not himself a Quaker was a nephew of Clarke and in sympathy with Quaker policy. Jones, Quakers, 199.

3. As a case in point may be mentioned the Rogerines of New London. Mass. Prov. Laws, VIII, 155, ch.102, 555. The Quakers made comparatively little impression on Connecticut. Bownas, the Quaker preacher who visited New England in 1702--1703, recorded that no meetings were held for two hundred miles in Connecticut, and remarked that, "The People being mostly rigid Presbyterians, counted it to be a great Crime to be at a Quakers Meeting," Bownas, Life and Travels, 116. About the time that the Connecticut law against heretics was revived, John Fothergill wrote "After staying a few Meetings on Long-Island we set out for New-England, having near two hundred Miles to travel by land through the Colony of Connecticut; in which Space there were few or no Friends, and the People generally very shy of us, and partly by reason of some severe Laws then in force there, they were afraid to converse with Friends." Fothergill, Life and Travels, 39.

4. The others represented in the Massachusetts General Court in 1700 were Newbury, Beverly, Boxford, Ipswich, Lynn, Rowley, Topsfield and Wenham.

5. Also Dedham, Hingham and Medfield.

6. The list also included Billerica, Chelmsford, Concord,

Marlborough, Malden, Medford, Reading, Sherburne, Sudbury and Woburn.

7. Oldmixon, Brit. Emp. in Am., I, 81--88, Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 238. The eastern shore of Narragansett Bay, including Bristol, Tiverton and Little Compton, was later surrendered to Rhode Island.

8. Typographus Lectori, with Joseph Baxter, Sermon, 89--98.

9. Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 254, ch.45.

10. Winsor, Boston, II, 188ff.

11. Ibid, 192ff.

12. Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 250, ch34, 29June 1700. "I would show all the Kindness that I can, unto the French Refugees arrived in this Country," 7 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 134, Cotton Mather's Diary, 8 Jan. 1686/87.

13. Backus, Baptists, I, 173--199, 205, 383--384; Wood, First Baptist Church of Boston; As late as 1696 Mather could speak of, "A Preacher in my Neighborhood, who, I hope, is a good Man, however hee bee not of my Perswasion, but a froward Anabaptist." 7 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 209.

14. While the general tendency was to be increasingly tolerant of this sect there were two parties in the matter, each including various shades of opinion. One of these was regretful of the former persecutions, the other only sorry that these had not been more effective. Among the latter it is disappointing to find Sewall. In spite of the presentation of the Quakers in Magnalia, (VII, 22,23) and the author's description of them in another place as "Malicious as well as---Pernicious Enemies", (Election Sermon, 1690, 34), Cotton Mather had already taken a stand against their persecution on which he prided himself. "Among other things, I

ran the Hazard of much Reproch by testifying in that Sermon (Election Sermon, 1692) against the Persecution of erroneous and conscientious Dissenters, by the civil Magistrate. I feared that the Zeal of my Country had formerly had in it more Fire than should have been; especially, when the mad Quakers were sent into the Callowes, that should have been kept rather in a Bedlam. I did therefore on this great Occasion bear my Testimony; hoping, that if the General Assembly now thank'd me for it, their doing so, would bee accepted both by God and Man. I think, I am the only Minister Living in the Land, that have testifyed against the Suppression of Haeresy, by Persecution." 7 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 149, Cotton Mather's Diary, 14 May 1692. The Quaker, Thomas Chalkley, visiting Boston in 1698, wrote, "I being a Stranger and Traveller could not but observe the barbarous and unchristianlike Welcome I had in Boston, the Metropolis of New-England. 'Oh! what pity,(said one,)it was that all of your Society was not hanged with the other Four! '" Chalkley, Journal, 18. "Remarkable was the Answer that one of his Neighbours made him, 'I wonder you are not ashamed to say so; for you know that the Judgments of God have been on our Country ever since.'" Chalkley, Answer to Metcalf, 389. Twenty years before this Mr. Holmes, minister at Duxbury who had then recently died, was described by John Cotton as "one of those who impute these dreadful frownes of Providence to our dealing with the Quakers." John Cotton to Increase Mather, 3 Jan. 1675/76. 4 Mass. Hist. Colls., VIII, 228.

15. Cf. George Keith, "In all the Continent of New England there is no Church of England I think, but at Boston, I have travelled through much of it, but never heard of any but that one."

Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., XI--XII.

16. A recent writer has described the pre-Quaker movement showing to what extent the ideas of George Fox existed in New England many years before the coming of the Friends. Rufus M. Jones, The Quakers in the American Colonies, London, 1911.

17. Backus, Baptists, I, 229, 450--453, 465; Thomas, Quakers, 209; Ellis, New Bedford, 34--36.

18. Thomas, Quakers, 212.

19. Jones, Quakers, 39, 40, 57, 58, 60.

20. Potter, First Cong. Soc. in New Bedford, 14.

21. Backus, Baptists, II, 306--310.

22. Bicknell, Barrington, passim; Backus, Baptists, I, 282--284, 453; II, 24; E. Williams to I. Backus, 25 Nov. 1774, Backus Papers, (New Eng. Baptist Hist. Soc.), Port. 2; I. Backus to J. Morse, 9 Mar. 1791, Backus Papers, (R. I. Hist. Soc.), I, 15.

23. John Cotton to Cotton Mather, 19 Apr. 1681, 4 Mass. Hist. Colls., VIII, 251--252.

24. Backus, Baptists, I, 452--454.

25. 175th Anniversary of the Organization of the United Cong. Ch. of Little Compton, R. I., 13.

26. Samuel Lee to Increase Mather, 25 Aug. 1687, 4 Mass. Hist. Colls., VIII, 540, "Mather Papers."

27. Bownas, Life and Travels, 120; Keith's Journal, 22,23.

28. Backus, Baptists, I, 405.

29. Chalkley, Journal, 18, 20; Keith's Journal, 8; Bownas, Life and Travels, 121.

30. Chalkley, Journal, 21, Keith's Journal, 10.

31. Bownas, Life and Travels, 121.

32. Chalkley, Journal, 21.

33. Keith's Journal, 13; Bownas, Life and Travels, 121.

34. Chalkley, Journal, 21.

35. Keith's Journal, 12--13.

36. Chalkley, Journal, 20.

37. Ibid, 39, 45.

38. Ibid, 22, 39, 45; Fothergill, Life and Travels, 40.

39. Chalkley, Journal, 19, 39; Bownas, Life and Travels, 120.

40. Chalkley, Journal, 39, 45.

41. Jones, Quakers, XV. Keith was underrating the Quaker strength in Massachusetts with a view to encouraging the authorities who had sent him to lead them from their error when he wrote, "Few Quakers are at Boston. [This is true.] There are some at Sandwich, some at Piscataway and others scattered Places, but very few." Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., XII.

42. Jones, Quakers, 141 note 2, 142 note 1; Moses Brown Papers, XVIII, 55; N.E. Yr. M., passim; A Brief Account of the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England, with the Subordinate Meetings of which it is composed, 11--22.

43. Jones, Quakers, 113. "The old spirit and Principle of ye ranters the Lord hath brought down in these parts, Truth having Gained ye Victory over them, so yt we meet with little opposition from them." Epistle to Lond. Yr. M., 1699. , Epistles Rec'd, I, 301; Lond. Yr. M., II, 302; "Aaron Atkinson's account of his Travells in America." Lond. Yr. M., II, 313.

44. The memorial of the Massachusetts government in respect to Quaker grievences in 1708 said,"nor are those that go Under the Denomination of Quakers now such as were then [17th century] who

were some of the Open bold Disturbers of the Publick Peace and their Principles notoriously known to be Heretical, but are much refined both in principles and Conversation." Mass. Archives, XI, 279--280. Four years later the New England Yearly Meeting was writing to the London Friends, "our Yearly meeting hath been Very Large, and Through the great Love and Contineued ffavor of ouer gratious God and Heavenly ffather , wee have Enioyed the Same without aney Disturbance; Ye Spirit of Ranterism which fformerly Interrupted our Quiett and peaceable assemblies being well Extingueshed." N.E. Yearly Meeting, 72; London Yearly Meeting, IV, 326.

45. There was a very general conception that the Quaker disregarded the Bible because of his assertion that salvation depended only upon "the light within" and that without it the suffering of Christ was insufficient.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SYSTEM IN PRACTICE.

Between the inauguration of royal government in Massachusetts and the first legal confession that the Congregational church-state system was weakening and forced to make concessions there were just thirty-six years. In this period various forces were struggling together. On the one hand appeared seventeenth century Calvinism, still guiding creed and platform, but troubled by what appeared to be the degeneracy of the times, a falling away from the fervent piety of the earlier generation. On the other hand there loomed large the newer spirit of persistent opposition to injustice in matters ecclesiastical which was at last to make its impression because of changes that were at the same time working internally. These thirty-six years saw two failures of the clergy to secure governmental sanction for the holding of a synod; it saw the death of the elder Mather; it saw also the beginnings of the Anglican movement in New England and its support by the royal governors; and it saw the persistent increase in the number of Quaker and Baptist meetings which finally brought about the first exemption laws in their favor. It is for these reasons that the first quarter century under the province charter was conspicuously transitional, and yet, in the first twenty years at least it represented the highest point which the Massachusetts church-state system reached so far as detailed legislation and the execution of effective measures was concerned. In the colonial period the name "theocracy" bestexpressed the nature of the government; in the early provincial period there existed the anomaly of an enterprising royal prov-

ince executing laws which maintained the shell of a weakening ecclesiasticism, the glory and fervor of which had departed. Yet another century had to pass before the system was allowed to expire and the opposing elements were at this time only beginning to organize themselves. On the threshold then of new adjustments in the old order, that system can best be examined, for those first adjustments made changes that greatly altered the whole legal procedure regarding ecclesiastical affairs. The foundation of the system was the first laws under the charter for maintaining religion; its opposing elements were the inward declination from standards of former days and the outer pressure of new hostile forces.

The idea usually conveyed by the expression "church establishment" is not applicable to Congregationalism in Massachusetts in the eighteenth century. The strong feeling of particularism which the first churches of Plymouth Colony had transmitted to the more Presbyterianly inclined meetings of the Bay had had its effect in the failure which Massachusetts Congregationalism constantly met when working toward any church platform that suggested a centralized government. Upon such a church government the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, Presbyterianism in Scotland and even in a slight degree the Presbyterianized Congregationalism of Connecticut were dependent. The clergy looked to their superiors for appointment and to them were definitely responsible while in the case of the English Church the crown itself was the last source of power. Support of priest and service was not a local matter and taxation for the church was no less a national concern than the expenses of foreign wars or the cost of the king's household. In Massachusetts the exact reverse was the case. The provincial as-

sembly, having ordered that each town be provided with a minister, put it into the power of that church and town to procure him and bargain with him; the provincial assembly, having ordered that he be maintained, left it with each town to assess and collect the taxes therefore. Only when difficulties ensued did the General Court appear on the scene of action, acting as a court of high appeal or giving advice to the contending parties. It is for this reason that the nature of the Massachusetts church in its relation to the state cannot be clearly understood without a very unusual emphasis upon local conditions and the course of events in many towns. Such a study must be very imperfect because of the nature of the material on which it should be founded.

The church and state relation was the conspicuous feature of the Massachusetts community. Whether the latter existed as a plantation so far unorganized, as a town proper with all its accompanying privileges, as a second precinct of an original town, formed on the basis of religious needs, or finally as a separate town again when the new precinct warranted such a measure,[1] the connection between the church and the town as no less between each and the Court of General Sessions or the General Assembly of the province, was close and vital.[2]

In the transitional or first stage through which a plantation passed before its erection as a town there was often a movement, especially in those frontier settlements which grew but slowly, for some encouragement of the ministry several years before township rights were granted.[3] Upon an appeal to the General Court it often responded with a direct money grant.[4] This transitional stage is comparatively rare in the provincial period, limited al-

most exclusively to the garrison towns, for by this time all the older townships were well established with extensive boundaries which included practically all the accessible parts of the province.

The change from unorganized plantation to town proper therefore is seen mainly in the frontier communities.[5] Upon the organization of these frontier posts as towns the regular laws for maintaining religion went into effect, but since the circumstances of their condition were unusual, numerous exceptions were made in their favor which gave the transition and resulting conditions an abnormal character.

The normal method of forming a new town in the provincial period was to cut off a part of an older township and erect it as a new one, or to create one from a part of an older township which had already been recognized as a separate precinct. The former was the more direct method and was sometimes resorted to when any friction in town or church affairs was likely to make the precinct arrangement impracticable. Several towns by this means skipped the precinct period.[5a]

However normal and direct this immediate formation of a new town from the outskirts of an old settlement may seem it was not the usual custom in the provincial period, and in the history of the "precinct", its origin, its nature, its relation to the parent town, can well be exhibited the application of the church-state system.[6]

The first settled towns of Massachusetts resembled small counties in their broad lying boundaries; and the meeting house, which represented the political as well as the religious center of the

community, was often many miles from those townsmen who had taken up with the more distant holdings. As time went on and population increased it was natural for the farms to form together in smaller groups which, as they increased in size became more and more dissatisfied with their long distance from the town's center, and growingly eager to begin a new community life of their own. As there were often reasons why the formation of a new town was undesirable, the precinct system was initiated, and was fairly well established when the provincial government began.

The order of events was somewhat in this wise. In a corner of some old township a group of farmers who numbered perhaps some twenty growing families, wished to have a church of their own.[7] There might be friction between them and the leading members of the one congregation, or the roads to town were well nigh impassable or a river dangerous of fording in the winter time. A movement would accordingly be started in the "hamlet" to petition the town to agree that they might be set off as a separate precinct. If permission was secured without further trouble the matter sometimes ended here, with the running of the boundary line between the old and new precincts and a mutual agreement with regard to the other matters, though an order from the General Court must in the end be gained.[8] It was far more usual for the parent town to be very loath to lose a large and flourishing section. The hamlet might not even apply to the town, quite aware of what the result would be, or upon application and refusal it would appeal to the General Court for interference in the matter. This petition which came from the inhabitants of the district concerned was usually referred to a committee made up of members of the court or inhabitants of

neighboring towns,[9] whose recommendations were usually accepted. But often the town was immediately informed of the application, especially if the petition had come direct from the hamlet without previous appearance in town meeting, and then the two sides were given hearings and long and elaborate negotiations followed. These struggles give an unusually clear picture of the ambitions and interests of rural Massachusetts in the early eighteenth century.[10] In the history of Springfield for example there appear during this period two particularly animated cases of attempts by outlying districts to gain precinct privileges. The inhabitants of the west side of the Connecticut River[11] applied for this degree of independence on the ground that bad roads were as nothing in comparison with the dangers of crossing the stream at some seasons of the year. But as Springfield offered a dogged resistance to such curtailment, the matter was soon carried (1695) to the General Court which summoned both parties and appointed an able committee to investigate the matter. While the west side was assuring the town of their ability to support a separate minister and stating that "wee have not the least thought of separating from you, or becoming a Townshipe, deeming it contrary to our Interest, and an infringement of our priviledges soe to doe,"[12] Springfield was grimly replying that they were too few to attempt any such thing and that "to row a boat or paddle a canoe is no worse than to saddle and bridle a horse."[13] The committee of the General Court was favorable to the west side and on December 4, 1696, the order was made for erecting West Springfield into a separate precinct. Even more determined did Springfield prove in her relation to the district of Longmeadow[14] which had found the town so obdurate that after

numerous attempts in town meeting covering the years between 1703 and1706, she finally petitioned the General Court for assistance. In this appeal was the statement that "wee have constantly paid our Dues towards maintainance of the Towne Minister & have for the Greatest part of these three years past upon our owne Charge hiered & provided a minister amongst ourselves & must without Releived [sic] be forced to do the same for the future except releefe be Granted."[15] In spite of Springfield's plea that she could not afford such a condition, now that the west side of the river had been cut off, and that she had placed the meeting house with the express purpose of accommodating Longmeadow, the court was not slow in granting the request, and within eight months after the date of the petition, Longmeadow was made a separate precinct.[16]

Between 1692 and 1728 some twenty new precincts were formed in this way by order of the General Court. In the resistance on the part of the town which was customary, economic reasons played the greatest part so that in the location of the final dividing line it was not unusual to bear in mind where lay the best land for cultivation.[17]

With the orders made by the General Courtfor the establishment of new precincts, there were regulations of the relation between the two parts of the town thus divided which were more or less elaborate as the case might require. These regulations concerned the financial method by which the new meeting house should be built and both maintained, the way in which the two ministers should be supported, and the disposal of the ministry land. Normally the new precinct would be excused from anyfurther payment toward the repair or rebuilding of the old meeting house or the sup-

port of the minister, as it was now responsible for its own. Normally also it must relinquish its common right to the parsonage lot of the original town and procure one for its future minister within its own boundaries. But the exceptions to this simple arrangement were numerous, caused by earlier town agreements, or special conditions in the township.[18] The complicated affairs of Sudbury between 1714 and 1722 introduced a custom of allowing a town as a whole to support its two precinct churches.[19] This possibility of a general assessment to be divided between two or more societies was recognized in several petitions submitted to the General Court,[20] and became increasingly popular.[21]

On some occasions a first precinct continued to levy ministerial rates on the inhabitants of a new one after a Court order had gone into effect, especially if the new precinct had been allowed conditionally, the old parish maintaining that the conditions had not been fulfilled.[22] If there had been special agreement with a minister at his settlement into which the whole town had entered in a peculiar way, the formation of a new precinct did not free its inhabitants from their obligations during his lifetime. But if the Court deemed that taxes were being levied unjustly by the old upon the new precinct, it was ordered to desist.[23]

Most serious of all matters regulated when a new precinct was formed, was likely to be the settlement of the proprietorship of the ministry land. In addition to the "settlement" which a town voted its minister, and which, in the early days was in land, later commuted to money, there were always the ministry or parsonage lands, generally including the"ministry house" or parsonage, which could only be held by the minister or his family during his pastor-

ate. Since this holding was more than likely to be in separate parcels in order to include the various kinds of land, such as wood lot, pasture and tilled land, the inevitable result was that if some of it fell within the borders of a would-be new precinct, trouble ensued.[24] On such an occasion the General Court would settle the affair with a compromise.

In arranging the boundaries between two precincts the General Assembly was often involved in intricate problems respecting certain farms which had expressed a definite preference for one precinct or the other. When these were adjacent to the boundary line there was little difficulty in arranging a survey which should place them in the section which they preferred. If, on the other hand, such farms lay well within the precinct limits, special exceptions for their convenience were included in the precinct order or in a later resolve, with explicit directions regarding the payment of taxes.[25]

In many cases these separate farms found themselves applying for transference not merely from one precinct to another but to a neighboring town which had set a meeting house much nearer them than was their own parish center. Even then the Court might grant the request.[26] Between two of the Cape Cod towns an unusual situation of this kind appeared. For several years previous to 1719 a number of families living on the eastern side of Harwich and bordering on Eastham had been attending the Eastham meeting house and had become members of the church, while all the time taxed to Harwich and giving nothing to Eastham, the people of the latter place being "so kind as to allow them the Benefit of the Meeting House without paying support." In 1719 however there was built in the

southern part of Eastham and only two miles from the Harwich farmers a meeting house which they would naturally attend, and they now considered it unreasonable to accept such a favor from Eastham as formerly, especially as Eastham now had the expense of two meeting houses. As it would be unjust to be obliged to pay their proportion towards support of worship in Harwich when they received no benefit from it, and yet pay their part of the charge at Eastham, they approached the town of Harwich to allow them to be cut off to Eastham. This was refused and the General Court, after considering the matter, produced a compromise measure whereby "the region was to be annexed to Eastham in all things relating to the public worship of God, but in all other respects to belong to the town of Harwich as formerly."[27]

Even when a court order had been obtained a difficulty might occur if a group of farms which had been "set off" to another town did not succeed in asserting its rights. In 1715 six farmers of Newton who two years before had been joined to Roxbury in ecclesiastical affairs brought the Assembly's attention to the fact that they were being rated to Newton, and some imprisoned for nonpayment. The Court finally interfered with a resolve in their favor.[28]

In the absence of special legislation it was not expected that a man would frequent a meeting house outside of his own precinct or town. He would inevitably be taxed for the ministry in the precinct in which he lived and was then likely to find himself rated in the other as well, unless the latter was of a very generous spirit.[29]

The foregoing statements have shown how the Massachusetts system of taxation for ministerial support was applied in the forma-

tion of towns from unorganized plantations, or of new precincts from old townships. With the last transformation, that of the precinct into the full fledged town again we reach the last step and here best may study the actual application of the laws of 1692, 1693 and 1695, which were the basis of the ecclesiastical system in the provincial period. The town must be provided with an "able, learned orthodox minister" who, according to the law of 1693, must be chosen by the church with a concurrence by the town, "all the inhabitants, and ratable estates lying within" the precinct to pay proportionally for his maintenance. This maintenance was based on three things, the ministry land which every town must put aside for the church and of which each minister had the use during his ministry, the "settlement," at first an additional piece of land to be made over directly to the settled minister and to remain in his family, later commuted to a money payment,[20] and finally the salary.[21] Settlement and salary were matters which required much consideration whenever a new minister was obtained, but the law had secured its requirements by stating that if a town neglected its duty in regard to maintenance of the ministry, the court of quarter sessions, upon complaint, should impose fines upon and even imprison those officials who failed to carry out their duties. The law of 1695 included a ministerial council for the enforcement of the law for choosing a minister, for the case had arisen of a town's failing to approve of a church's choice, and the council was to act much in the capacity of arbiter. Yet over all the General Court remained the final appeal from both County Court and ecclesiastical council, and by holding the purse strings of the province treasury could exert an effective influence in carrying out her own commands.

There are several records of special permits in regard to ministry land,[32] but on the whole the General Court was called upon less often to arrange matters regarding this than either settlement or salary.

The settlement was a variable quantity, large in the first instances and in the poorer towns, where land could be more easily secured than money, and growing smaller as time went on and the salary grew more definitely fixed. In 1722/23 the proprietors of the Indian town of Natick asked that they might be empowered to give to Mr. Oliver Peabody, upon his settling among them in the work of the ministry, a lot or lots containing one hundred acres of land and meadow and to make him a commoner or proprietor in such plantation, "they being uncapable of giving any other encouragement."[33] Money settlements were later introduced, and these could be raised either by subscription or a rate.[34]

On the whole the question of settlement was a town matter but in arranging for the call of a minister and his salary the Courts of General Sessions were on the alert and the provincial assembly was ready to support them. While Malden between 1705 and 1708, just after the death of a pastor, "wth all manner of Application Endeavoured a New Settlemt of the Ministry among them, and [had] given an Invitation to Several worthy Gentlemen to Preach wth them for a Taste of their Gifts in Order to a further proceedure," the town found herself under presentment for being destitute of a minister who was immediately supplied by the Court of Quarter Sessions for Middlesex County. But as the town had just taken steps to call another man it was obliged to appeal to the General Court to approve the minister of its own choice rather than the protegé of

the justices.[35] This same year saw a part of the long struggle between the town of Medford and the Middlesex justices who had interfered some time before, charging Medford with being destitute of a minister, as they did not recognize the questionable incumbent, Mr, Woodbridge. Ecclesiastical councils and many court sittings failed to settle the matter, so it finally reached the provincial assembly. The investigating committee appointed reported that they were of the opinion that "their wound is Incurable and that it is necessary that the Reverend Mr. Benja Woodbridge and the Town of Medford be parted; according to the Advice of the Council of Churches there, July 10th 1705. and the Orders of Quarter Sessions of Middlesex." Upon his removal the town was ordered to pay him forty pounds and "the Nine Sabbaths Contribution now in the hands of Mr. John Whitmore." It was also directed speedily to procure and settle another minister "And this Court do Advise mr Woodbridge by no means to discourage the Coming and Settlement of another Minister among them.."[36]

It was not usually these older towns of the province where orthodox Congregationalism was strongest and the order of church government best developed that called for interference but rather those outlying districts where external causes created a different type of community existence. This was the situation in the many frontier towns of Hampshire and Worcester counties, of the New Hampshire border and along the Maine coast. Yet many of these towns were planned on lines which showed an effort to conform to standing rules in ecclesiastical matters and were only prevented by the exigencies of the situation. Very different was the atmosphere in the unorthodox towns of the old Plymouth Colony whose early

history has already been described. With these two types of towns the Justices of the Peace and the lawmakers of the province had the closest connection in the affairs of church and state.

If a plantation or town was a recognized garrison it was natural that the appointment of a chaplain should go with other military appointments and that the public treasury should pay him. A chaplain would then act as minister of the town about the garrison and in time of peace might continue there. Other frontier towns which had not been made garrisons but had found themselves destitute by reason of war or the desertion of settlers prayed the provincial assembly for financial assistance in the support of their minister or that the Court would procure and send one to them.[37]

As early as 1693 the Court, in answer to a petition of Samuel Wheelwright, representative of York and Wells in the Assembly, appointed chaplains for the garrisons at those outposts and ordered fifty shillings a month for their pay out of the province treasury, "over and above what shall be allowed them by the inhabitants."[38] Not long after, the upper part of Kittery, known then as Newichawannock, was encouraged by the success of York and Wells to send off a similar appeal, and the response was an order for ten pounds out of the province treasury.[39]

The same region in 1697, now known as Berwick, was honored with the sum of fifty pounds in two instalments, towards the maintenance of a minister for the garrison there.[40] At the close of the war fifteen pounds again came for the support of the ministry,[41] and a further payment of ten pounds in 1701.[42]

At the proclamation of peace and the withdrawal of the garrison Wells, finding herself with no minister and the old meeting house

burned, begged for help that her twenty-seven families might build a new house of worship and support a minister and was allowed fifteen pounds towards his maintenance.[43] York, though retaining the chaplain as her minister, was unable to raise his salary and again twelve pounds came from Boston upon Samuel Moody's own petition for services which he had been rendering for a year after peace was secured.[44]

During the remaining years up to 1712, when special orders of this kind for Wells, York and Berwick ceased, somewhat over one hundred pounds were in this way voted outright for the support of the ministry in these three towns, part of which was for building meeting houses.[45] In 1703 the simple method was adopted of ordering the constables of Wells and York to pay fifteen and ten pounds respectively of the province tax last levied on the town to the minister.[46]

Not until Wells, York and Berwick were well on their feet and no longer receiving public aid did the far eastward settlement of Winter Harbor receive assistance. Upon memorials offered by the ministers of York and Wells, a committee was appointed to lay out a road and investigate the state of affairs. The report of this committee was so favorable to public assistance that forty pounds were immediately ordered for the support of a minister.[47] Between 1717 and 1725 over two hundred pounds were voted to the ministry at Winter Harbor which in 1718 was made the town of Biddeford and after 1723 shared its minister with the neighboring Arundel, the "Gentleman that preforms the Said Service to preach on the Lords Days alternately---If the Weather will permit."[48]

During the last two years of aid to Biddeford and Arundel, the

town of Scarborough, upon several petitions of its minister Mr. Hugh Henry, received sixty pounds in three instalments because of the low circumstances to which it had been reduced by the Indian wars.[49]

The year 1725 marked also the second grant of a large sum to Falmouth on Casco Bay. In 1722 the town had received forty pounds towards finishing a meeting house and now, three years later, an additional fifty pounds.[50]

Among the nearer frontier towns of the New Hampshire border and Worcester County, the year 1696 saw thirty pounds voted towards the maintenance of a minister at the garrison at Dunstable, and in the following year twenty pounds were paid to Thomas Weld the minister there.[51] At the close of the war the town like its sisters in Maine was loath to lose public assistance, and the inhabitants, the selectmen, the town's representative in Boston and finally the minister himself sent in a constant stream of petitions to the General Court between 1698 and 1714 which resulted in twelve separate grants varying from ten to twenty-six pounds, and becoming after 1709 an almost regular payment of twenty pounds per annum.[52]

The two towns of Worcester County that through the longest period were pensioners of the public treasury in the maintenance of the ministry were Lancaster on the northern frontier and Brookfield far to the westward. The death of the Rev. John Whiting in the attack on Lancaster, Sept. 11, 1697, with the subsequent difficulty which the inhabitants felt they would have in persuading anyone to settle with them resulted in the first petition for aid, which was presented, and twenty pounds was immediately voted.[53] In 1704 the sum of forty pounds was allowed for building a meeting house.[54]

Brookfield which was maintained as an outpost and garrison for many years before its estate warranted township privileges was applying to the court for relief as early as 1698 and the last money payment granted it was made in 1714, the total reaching over two hundred pounds.[55]

On the Connecticut River frontier there were only two settlements whose circumstances put them in need of public aid in their ministerial charges through this whole period, these two lying well to the northward and open to the Indian incursions which followed down this river. Deerfield, which as a garrison received ten pounds out of the province treasury in 1696 for the maintenance of John Williams,[56] was given double that sum in 1703.[57] The next year, following the Deerfield massacre and the captivity of Williams, the Court resolved to send a chaplain to the town and to allow him twenty pounds for six months' service,[58] which was repeated in 1705[59] and 1706 at which time it was decided to assess a certain amount upon the town as well, in spite of the fact that the town itself had had nothing to do with the calling of Benjamin Choate, and had made no agreement with him.[60] At the end of the same year, upon the return of Williams from captivity, forty pounds was paid from the province treasury toward his support,[61] and during the next five years over one hundred pounds went to a like service, varying in amounts from ten to thirty pounds.[62] Northfield, where settlement was much hindered by the progress of the war, received her first instalment of public funds as late as 1718, when forty pounds was voted for the support of her minister, and an additional thirty pounds in 1724.[63]

Of the other frontier settlements which received definite aid

of this kind may be mentioned Stow,[64] Leicester[65] and Tisbury on Martha's Vineyard.[66] On one occasion the province of Massachusetts Bay cooperated with New Hampshire. In 1705 fourteen pounds were voted from the province treasury towards the maintenance of a minister on the Isles of Shoals provided the northern province paid six pounds for the same purpose, "considering the Greater Part of the Inhabitants of the Isles of Shoals, belong to the Province of New Hampshire."[67]

So long as the recipient of these money payments was purely a chaplain at a garrison there was nothing unusual in this method of appointing and maintaining him, but since he was considered, even when chaplain, also the minister for the small community grouped around the fort and was often retained when the immediate necessity for a garrison had ceased, his position in relation to the church is interesting. Between 1693 and 1725 almost sixteen hundred pounds, varying in amounts from ten to fifty pounds, was in this way voted by the Massachusetts General Court to the maintenance of the ministry or the building of meeting houses in frontier communities, and in no way did the province as a whole come nearer to possessing an established church in the generally accepted use of the term. The direct method of appropriating money was the one most often used but on various occasions certain indirect means were adopted. The amount of the province tax was reduced with the understanding that town rates for the support of a minister could then be assessed and collected, or the whole amount was ordered to be turned back to the constables for the use of the ministry. Occasionally some special means of taxation was allowed which would bring in more money than the normal method would have produced.[68]

Such was likely to bear heaviest on non-resident proprietors.[69] In 1720 the House of Representatives excused three towns for failing to send representatives to Boston, Needham and Brookfield because of the charge they were under in building meeting houses and Manchester because it was settling a minister.[70]

This rigorous paternalism in the enforcement of ecclesiastical law was not limited, as has been observed, to the frontier communities of the province, though here it was most often exercised. For them the General Court was merely continuing a policy adopted in the colonial period and explicable on the ground that as religious worship was deemed essential to the good morals of a town or plantation, hence of the province as a whole, it was a pious duty to appropriate funds for the support of religious worship where poverty and meager population made an independent maintenance difficult. After 1691 a new and curious problem presented itself, the cause and nature of which has already been discussed. In dealing with the "unorthodox" communities of Barnstable and Bristol counties the Massachusetts General Court assumed a new and very different position from that which she had held in managing her frontier posts. In the enforcement of ecclesiastical law in Swansea, Freetown and Attleboro, Dartmouth, Tiverton and Little Compton, Sandwich and Falmouth she became preeminently the dictator of orthodoxy, in two of these towns using her power to displace a religious organization which represented the almost unanimous opinion of the inhabitants.

In 1692, when the Assembly began to put once more into legislation her ecclesiastical system it was facing but two groups of dissenting interests. Of these the Baptists had but one strongly organized body and the Quakers were limited to certain definite sec-

tions of territory. On Cape Ann, that region of the old Bay Colony where heretical opinions best flourished and Quakerism found a ready acceptance, this element never secured sufficient prominence in any town to cause the interference of the General Court. Though there was always difficulty at Salem and Lynn in collecting from the Quakers the ministerial assessment,[71] they were never in sufficient numbers to block legislation and no towns of Essex County ever suffered presentment for lack of a minister.[72]

Of the newly acquired section of territory, embracing Plymouth, Barnstable and Bristol Counties, in the vicinity of Plymouth a similar condition prevailed.[73] On Cape Cod[74] difficulties were greater as the Quakers were here more numerous, though not usually in the majority. At Sandwich and Falmouth they resisted the collectors for many years and were regularly distrained of their goods in accordance with the law.[75] When in 1707 the General Sessions of Barnstable Countydiscovered that these two towns were defective with respect to the ministry they gave orders according to the law of 1706, but enforcement was difficult. The matter reaching the General Court, the latter voted twenty pounds from the province treasury for the ministry at Falmouth,[76] by this act setting a precedent for future years. The year 1713 saw the sum of forty pounds held out as an inducement to the building of a meeting house.[77] On later occasions the General Court was forced to come to the assistance of Joseph Metcalf,[78] the minister, when he complained of the depreciation of the paper currency, of which the town refused to take account.[79] In 1714 and 1717 he was allowed forty pounds from the province treasury, after which, in 1719, his case was turned over to "the Committee, that received the Charity of this Province Col-

lected the Last Year, upon a Brief Issued forth by this Government for the Propagating of the Gospel."[80]

If in Barnstable County Massachusetts had a suggestion of the problems which could be created by elements unfriendly to her system, in Bristol the difficulty was many times magnified. At Swansea the enforcement of ecclesiastical law was thwarted by a firmly organized Baptist society; at Dartmouth was the most vigorous Quaker meeting of the province, always supported by the Baptists in its borders; at Tiverton was a smaller Quaker community; while Attleboro, Freetown and Little Compton were towns of mixed type, harboring various sects and sympathizing keenly with Rhode Island in her ideas of religious liberty. In this region also a further element of resistance to the Massachusetts state church appeared in the first decade of the eighteenth century when the missionaries of the S.P.G. met some success in the Rhode Island border towns.[81] Here they left behind them a number of groups which had announced their allegiance to the Church of England. On this basis these proceeded to resist the ecclesiastical laws of the province but seldom united in this purpose with the Baptist and Quaker societies.

The first attack made by the Court of General Sessions of Bristol County in accordance with the laws of 1692 and 1693 was upon Swansea, whose only meeting was the Baptist Church now thirty years old. To enforce upon it the congregational ministry and public taxation for his support was to upset its whole system. When presented for not having a minister chosen by law, Swansea in town meeting proceeded to approve the Baptist preacher as her minister.[82] The law had not made it plain how the justices were to proceed in such a case, and the matter was dropped for the time

being.

It was in 1698 that Bristol Sessions began to deal vigorously with all its defective towns, continuing this attempt for a period of thirty years. But so clearly defined was the type of community which it had to master and so determined was the opposition to its authority that the attempt resulted only in a series of compromises, many of which foreshadowed the coming exemption laws. In all these years it was never possible to enforce the law in this section of Massachusetts.

In 1698 failure to procure a minister was reported by the Grand Inquest for Swansea, Dartmouth, Tiverton, Freetown and Attleboro, while most of this group with Rehoboth and Little Compton lacked school masters.[83] The selectmen of these towns, summoned to Bristol, had various reports to submit. Swansea, as previously [illegible], sent word that she was provided, but the statement was for a time not accepted, and she was ordered to procure a minister immediately.[84] By April 1699 however the justices had been informed of the exact situation in Swansea and agreed not to interfere with the ministry of Samuel Luther as had been agreed by the General Sessions six years earlier.[85] As a matter of fact the Baptist Church of Swansea, by standing for principles so liberal that it was able to include the Congregationalists in the region, long saved the town from an effective attack by the General Sessions. Not until it was remolded upon a more extreme Baptist form did the Congregationalists of Swansea become dissatisfied. The result of this dissatisfaction was a petition to the General Sessions in 1707 asking the assistance of the justices in procuring an orthodox minister. The selectmen of Swansea who were summoned at this time

reminded the General Sessions of the long continued recognition by that body of their minister and after postponement and much discussion a compromise was agreed upon.[86] While it was decided that orthodoxy must be introduced into Swansea and a sum assessed upon the town for the support of the ministry it was agreed that the work of Luther ought to be recognized. Accordingly it was voted that half of the yearly assessment should be settled on him, the rest to go to the minister of the standing order.[87] But no very satisfactory arrangement was discovered until the town was divided,[88] the Congregationalists forming the new parish.[89] After the death of Luther there was a momentary difficulty as Swansea's dispensation had related to him only. The matter was settled by a vote of the General Sessions in 1719 to accept his successor as minister of the town, and the selectmen, who had been summoned to state the case, were dismissed.[90]

The affairs of Dartmouth and Tiverton during this same period represent the methods employed by the government in handling well defined Quaker communities. In Dartmouth the people were almost universally Quaker, the Congregational and Baptist societies very small; in Tiverton, while the majority supported Quaker teaching, there were among the inhabitants many who shared the general characteristics of the eastern border of the bay. With their freedom in theological opinion which often kept them from allying themselves with any sect, there was a certain volatility in their make-up which occasionally carried them into some religious body and out again in a very brief time. The S.P.G. in dealing with them met constant disappointment for it was long in learning that a crowded service here meant little real allegiance. These people

were no less trying to the Quakers than to the Anglican and Congregational churches.

The General Sessions of October 1698, which had attacked Swansea, took up the cases of both Dartmouth and Tiverton. Dartmouth, like Swansea, stated that she was provided with ministers already, naming two Quaker preachers of the town. Neither this nor Tiverton's answer was accepted, and both towns were ordered to supply themselves before the winter sessions.[91]

For some time the relation between the Court of General Sessions and the towns of Dartmouth and Tiverton was little changed. Over and over they suffered presentment and repeatedly sent answer that they were properly supplied in the persons of the Quakers whom they named, basing their argument on the fact that nowhere in the law was it stated what was meant by orthodox.[92]

This state of affairs continued until the autumn of 1703.[93] Bristol Court then became exasperated and took a step which was significant. Relying upon the right which a recent law (1702) had given her to appoint special assessors the Court of General Sessions decided to enforce the law of 1692 which gave her the power of appointing ministers to negligent towns. It was agreed that eighty pounds per annum be levied on Dartmouth and fifty on Tiverton for the support of ministers whom she should appoint. Not knowing suitable persons for these missions the Court ordered that a letter be written to the president and fellows of Harvard College and Mr. William Brattle of Cambridge for their assistance.[94]

Though going so far as to take these measures the justices now allowed the matter to slide[95] until April 1706 when they renewed their application to authority, including now the Boston ministers.[96]

Their next meeting despatched two of its members to Dartmouth and Tiverton to enquire for a place or family where a minister might be entertained,[97] and upon receiving a most pessimistic report once more agreed to state the situation in Boston.[98]

The episode was at least making an impression on the ministerial circle in the capital town though progress with effective measures was slow.[99] Once more it was hoped that results might be gained by further legislation and the act of November 1706, now passed, went much farther than any previous laws had done. The failure of Bristol General Sessions in dealing with her troublesome towns was to be obviated by bringing the General Court itself into the situation. After making the necessary orders on a delinquent town and failing with results, the Court of General Sessions was now ordered to make report of its proceedings at the next session of the General Court, and the latter was not only to supply a minister to such a town but also to provide for his support by a sum added to the town's province tax. By concealing this amount within the country rate the General Court expected to effect her purpose in towns which had never failed to remit their assessments.

Bristol Sessions in the following year gave Dartmouth and Tiverton one more chance,[100] but when they still neglected her orders, immediately agreed to carry the matter to the General Court.[101]

A complete report of the contest between Bristol Sessions and the towns of Dartmouth and Tiverton, with an elaborate petition, was now submitted the Assembly. An appeal was made by the latter to the fellows of the college,[102] and before another year had gone by a minister had been sent to each town, Joseph Marsh[103] to Tiverton and Samuel Hunt[104] to Dartmouth.[105] Their regular appointments were

made in the court session of the following summer when their salaries were voted with the understanding that the sums were to be added to the province rates of the towns.[106] The opposition raised by Dartmouth and Tiverton upon their discovery of what had occurred was one of the first and most important steps taken by the New England Quakers in their struggle against Massachusetts ecclesiastical laws. In spite of petitions from a Dartmouth town meeting[107] and the Dartmouth Monthly Meeting of the Friends[108] the matter was pushed forward by the authorities. Within a short time both towns were in arrears of taxes and their assessors in gaol at Bristol.[109]

Succeeding events in both Dartmouth and Tiverton show how the General Court was forced to compromise in spite of her legislation of 1706. Samuel Hunt whom the Court had sent to Dartmouth proved to be a man of unusual breadth in his relations with the town. He refused to have the law enforced on Dartmouth for his advantage, maintaining constantly that he was a missionary and as such should be regularly paid by the province.[110] For this reason the difficulties so serious in 1708 subsided in subsequent years.

The General Court complied with his request and beginning with a grant of fifteen pounds to finish the meeting house in Dartmouth,[111] voted him various payments of fifteen or twenty pounds between 1709 and 1716.[112] A large grant of one hundred pounds made in 1722, upon a petition from the orthodox inhabitants for an annual salary for Hunt, and added by the General Court to the province tax of the town, upset this arrangement and became the occasion of a long and obstinate battle.

The chief difference between these and the corresponding events

in Tiverton was that the General Court, in spite of repeated efforts, was never able to keep a Congregational minister long in the latter town. In 1710 twenty-one pounds was voted from the province treasury for the brief services of two men whom the General Court had sent to Tiverton,[113] but upon an appeal of the orthodox inhabitants for a further appointment,[114] the Assembly merely ordered the ministers of the neighboring towns to preach at Tiverton during the summer at twenty shillings a Sunday, paid from the public treasury.[115] When in October the order was repeated an earnest expostulation came from Samuel Danforth, minister at Taunton, who foresaw the difficulties of travelling to Tiverton in the winter and urged the appointment of a resident minister on the ground that a meeting house was already partly built.[116] Hereupon a man was secured at twenty shillings a week,[117] but his congregation was meager and his stay brief.[118] In 1712 the General Court ordered twenty-five pounds for the ministry at Tiverton or "in proportion for such part of the year as they are supplied with a learned, orthodox Minister,"[119] but the inducement accomplished little. The following years saw only fruitless attempts by the General Sessions and the Assembly to carry out the law, cajolery, threats and further ecclesiastical legislation proving of no avail.[120] While it was as early as 1717 that the General Court voted seventy pounds from the public treasury for the support of a minister[121] whom the General Sessions had recently voted to secure,[122] it was not until 1722 that this sum was actually added, as in the case of Dartmouth, to the town's country rate. The resistance made by the Quakers in behalf of the assessors of the two towns, imprisoned for failure to assess these sums, won an Order in Council on their behalf and

was the indirect cause of the first local exemption legislation.

In Swansea and Dartmouth the Court of General Sessions of Bristol County and the Massachusetts General Court were meeting the opposition of well defined religious bodies fighting for a principle; in Tiverton the same was true in less degree. In the towns of Attleboro, Little Compton and Freetown, which Bristol Sessions included in her attack of October 1698, the justices found themselves baffled by a lack of religious enthusiasm united with an ardent feeling for social independence rather than any strong heterodox opinions. In the course of events the Massachusetts authorities learned that if they took these unusual conditions into consideration and modified their regular system more could be done in such a place than in a strongly anti-Congregational community. The settlement of the ministry was an economic and social rather than a religious question.

The unwillingness of the inhabitants of Freetown to be interfered with in a matter where pocket books were involved is suggested in their answer to Bristol Court's warning in 1698. The "Poverty & inability" of the town were the alleged causes for their failure to comply with the law, and in the following year "their poor low & scattered Condition was one Reason (notwithstanding their Endeavors for divers years past) why they Could not obtainea minister."[123]

For the next few years Freetown gave sufficient evidence of attempts to settle a minister to avoid presentment and in 1704 did secure William Way to serve as minister and schoolmaster,[124] but various facts show that he was not "learned and orthodox." He agreed to accept from his parish a voluntary contribution rather than

a public maintenance and failed to receive the necessary approbation of Samuel Danforth of Taunton.[125] In the meantime the preaching of the first missionaries of the S.P.G. had made an impression in Freetown. Of two important things the people were convinced,--that a member of the Church of England could not be taxed by any other ecclesiastical body and that a missionary sent to them from England would have to be recognized by the standing order. Moreover he would need no great financial support,--at least no regular legal assessment,--since he would have a salary from the Venerable Society. The majority of the townsmen accordingly were induced to declare for the Church of England, a town vote was passed to this effect and a letter written to Samuel Myles of Boston urging him to forward their declaration to the Bishop of London. In the following months Freetown turned aside various warnings from the county court on the ground that she was waiting to hear from England.[126] Matters were in the meantime not pushed by the General Sessions as the justices had come to the conclusion that orthodoxy could never be forced upon Freetown without some assistance from the public treasury.[127]

That such a recommendation was to be made to the General Court may have reached the ears of a minority in Freetown who were led by Congregationalists. Perhaps aware of the money grants which Dartmouth and Tiverton had already received, this group petitioned the General Court in 1709,[128] and were supported in their appeal by Samuel Danforth of Taunton.[129] The wording of Danforth's communication indicates that he recognized conditions in Freetown so peculiar that some special dispensation might have to be granted if a Congregational minister was to be settled in the place. The support

of those witholding their names from Freetown's petition might be gained by yielding forced maintenance and allowing the town to pay the minister by voluntary contributions as it had done in the case of William Way.

This suggestion was accepted and proved successful. Joseph Avery who was sent to Freetown received in addition to the province grants[130] only the voluntary pledges of his hearers, and on this basis was able to win the support of many of the townsmen.[131] After his departure the town lapsed once more into dissention[132] which was only increased by the advent in 1715 of Thomas Craghead who was sent by the General Court.[133] Of an impetuous and domineering character he was unwilling to let matters rest as they had in Avery's time but went in January 1718 and procured an act of Bristol Court to compel Freetown to pay him a salary of sixty-five pounds a year, beginning on the day that he was chosen minister.[134] The older method of handling Freetown with leniency was now abandoned and later events show with what little success.

The money demanded by Craghead was assessed in 1717, 1718 and 1719, though the constables failed to collect it. They were than imprisoned, and not released in spite of appeals to both Bristol Court and the General Assembly.[135] In March 1720 Craghead, determined to gain some part of his salary still in arrears, applied to the General Court for certain sums against the three constables. This application resulted in a court order to the justices of the General Sessions of the Peace for the County of Bristol to grant out warrants of distress to the sheriff to distrain the goods or estates of these defective collectors.[136] Although Craghead soon severed his connection with Freetown his attempt to gain his unpaid

salary extended into the summer of 1723. While his efforts were never crowned with success he was backed constantly by the justices of Bristol County and by the General Court of the province.[137]

The chief result of the later policy of the government in dealing with Freetown was the alliance of many of the opposers of a state church with the Quaker cause or with neighboring Baptist societies. In 1729, 1730, 1732 and 1733 Freetown was presented for lack of a minister,[138] and when in 1747 a Congregational minister was actually settled in Freetown it was with the express understanding between himself and the people that he should not "directly nor indirecLly take advantage of ye Laws of this Province to get a salary settled cn me in ye town of Freetown, but look for and expect my support bythe free will offering of ye People."[139]

The conditions in Little Compton slightly resembled those in Freetown, for although there was an orthodox society in the place at an early date it was long unable to maintain itself without careful supervision by the General Sessions. In 1699, in response to an appeal from this church, the court gave the town a legal order for raising forty pounds to be paid to the minister. When the selectmen failed to assess this sum they were fined forty shillings each.[140] The same occurred with their successors in 1700 and again in 1701.[141] It was this situation at Little Compton which was chiefly responsible for the legislation of 1702 giving the County Court the right of appointing a special board of assessors if the town officers neglected their duty. In the case of Little Compton this new measure was resorted to,[142] but progress was now blocked by the constables who failed to collect the sums assessed.[143] A compromise was finally reached which lasted until the time of the exemption legislation.[144]

The difficulties which Attleboro encountered in ecclesiastical matters were due to two causes,--her semi-frontier location and her proximity to the most unorthodox settlements of New England. From 1698 to 1708 her affairs often figured in the business of Bristol Sessions. At first the excuse given was her "low, smale & Divided Condition." Later she reported repeatedly that she was taking steps to provide herself with a minister as ordered, but found it difficult to attract anyone on account of her poverty and small extent.[145] Final success came after an appeal to the General Court, for the latter responded to the petition with the reannexation of fourteen families to her authority.[146]

The rigidity in the church life of Massachusetts in the early eighteenth century was the result of the provincial ecclesiastical legislation with its active enforcement throughout the province. The strong particularism of the individual churches prevented Congregationalism in Massachusetts from acquiring the centralized organization which the corresponding system in Connecticut assumed, but on the side of its relation to the state the Massachusetts church looked more and more toward a central authority. The Court of General Sessions of the Peace was given power over the towns, and in time the General Court took upon itself the ultimate enforcement of the legislation.[147] In relation to the various towns and precincts, existing as ecclesiastical bodies, the authority of the General Court was greater than appeared on the face of any act. By law a minister was chosen by his church with the approval of the town, and bargained with the latter for his salary. But the General Court took a conspicuous place in the appointment and removal of ministers as well as in naming a choice when two were offering

claims. It was often called upon to settle disputes regarding the method of paying his salary and the disposition of the ministry lands when new precincts were formed. The appeals came from the towns or presincts, ecclesiastical councils or from county courts. For the towns the General Court decided whether circumstances warranted the formation of a new precinct, and if so, what arrangements should be made. The proper location of the meeting house was always an important matter as this building usually formed the civic center of the community. From church councils came to Boston various ecclesiastical matters, principally relating to choice of ministers. From the county courts came the problem of dealing with delinquent towns and town officials. The Assembly might sanction or reverse council or county court orders. Finally the Great and General Court, by holding the purse strings of the province, was able in great measure to enforce her own commands.

Only when encountering opponents of the system in such numbers that they formed a majority of the community, was the General Assembly forced to make alterations in her scheme of ecclesiastical control. In several towns of Massachusetts the early years of the eighteenth century saw the voluntary system in use for the support of the ministry and in one of these towns a Baptist preacher was actually accepted as the minister of the place. The increasing severity in ecclesiastical legislation was running at the side of but in a losing race with the growing independence of the "dissenters." The early exemption legislation was little more than a registration of what they had already accomplished.

NOTES.

1. Channing, Town and County Government, 35.

2. A number of excellent attempts have been made to define the terms relating to New England local government in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These are usually broader than the present subject requires and should be slightly modified before a perfectly clear idea can be gained of the Massachusetts ecclesiastical system in the early provincial period. Township which Channing tells us (Town and County Government, 35) at first meant merely a tract of land granted to persons who intended there to set a town and gather a church, is already used almost synonymously with town, though less often, and when so used is likely to have a territorial sense in contradistinction to town as a civil organization. A group of homesteads not to be considered as a civil organization may be termed a village, and if it is the outlying settlement of some older town the name hamlet is not uncommon, as Salem village (later called Danvers) or the hamlet of Billingsgate, a part of Eastham. Plantation, while sometimes used in a general way for town, has more often the technical meaning observed by Channing, of a community which has not yet acquired the dignity of a town. (Town and County Government, 35.) The precinct, parish or district, as it was interchangeably called, though far less clearly defined than the town itself, was a most essential part of the Massachusetts ecclesiastical system and will be later described at length. Briefly it was a division of a town cut off for convenience in regard to attendance at worship and support of the ministry. It had at the same time non-ecclesiastical causes and characteris-

tics which are inclined to detract from its real significance as a little church-state, its most important element. This fact is underestimated by Howard (Local Constitutional History, 52.) and his definitions are therefore less satisfactory. The name parish was not used interchangeably with town. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 65.

3. Buck, Mass. Ecc. Law, 151, refers to the organization of the church before the town as the custom of the country but this method was not sufficiently general in the early provincial period as to warrant such a statement.

4. Brookfield, 1698, 1702. Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 197, ch. 37; 346, ch. 27.

5. Biddeford, 1716, 1718. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 475, ch.42; 626, ch. 98.

Brookline, 1705.

5a. Mass. Prov. Laws, VIII, 124, ch. 22, 145, ch. 73 et alia; Sunderland, 1718. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 621, ch. 88.

6. Considered as an ecclesiastical unit the precinct may be defined as the geographical division of a town the inhabitants of which were in ecclesiastical law the attendants at a single meeting house. Channing, Town and County Government, 36, follows Buck, Mass. Ecc. Law, 17--18. Because of the close relation between church and state this formation involved also a civil status for the precinct, of chief importance in the collection of taxes. For this purpose the precinct generally had its separate constable or collectors and a separate precinct meeting with its own moderator and business. It was therefore equivalent to a constablewick. Mass. Prov. Laws, VIII, 141, ch. 64. A separate school was usually supported by the new precinct which in this way became a second district. Channing, Town and County Government, 36. The precinct

was in the third place a military unit, such a condition sometimes occurring within a town before a second ecclesiastical precinct had been formed. Braintree, 1707. Mass. Archives, XI, 241. Precinct and less often parish were the technical names for such a division of a town, the latter becoming later associated chiefly with its ecclesiastical functions, a meaning which it has brought down to the present day in a modified form. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 288, ch. 5. The name society which was applied to the persons of a precinct in their corporate existence has continued in the organization of the older Congregational churches of New England to the present day. The religious body organized as the church relegates its non-religious functions to the corporate body known as the society which is made up of the enfranchised members of the parish and manages the finances of the church. Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 246, ch. 19.

7. Cotton Mather, Ratio Disciplinae, 1--2, describes this same development from the point of view of church government. "A Number of Christians," he writes, "either swarmed into a New Plantation, or finding the Church, to which they have belonged, grown to such Circumstances, that it may be for the general advantage to have a New Church formed in the Neighborhood, first settle their Number, and assure themselves that their Number is Competent, and Resolved for the Undertaking."

8. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 447, ch. 147.

9. West Springfield, 1696. Mass. Prov. Laws, VIII, 111, ch. 12; Of the committee here appointed Edward Taylor was minister to the church in Westfield, Samuel Partridge the representative from Hatfield in the General Court, Aaron Cooke from Hadley and

Samuel Root from Westfield, the towns in Hampshire County nearest to the west precinct of Springfield.

10. The case of Watertown between 1692 and 1707 is typical. Mass. Archives, XI, 63, 64, 73, 86--87, 75, 85, 81; Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 55, ch.20 et passim; Cal. State Papers. Am. and W. Inds., 1700, 241, 246.

11. Mass. Archives, XI, 109, 107, 112, 114, 118, 130; Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 77, ch. 9, 111, ch. 12, 127, ch. 45.

12. Mass. Archives, XI, 110. 12 May 1696.

13. Mass. Archives, XI, 114.

14. Mass. Archives, XI, 215--217; Mass. Prov. Laws, VIII, 198, ch. 91, 233, ch. 13.

15. Mass. Archives, XI, 215. 18 Oct. 1706.

16. Ibid, XI, 215.

17. Plymouth, 1695. Mass. Archives, XI, 92--100; Scituate, 1700. Mass. Archives, XI, 144, 145, 156, 159.

18. Chelmsford, 1724. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 516, ch.238.

19. Ibid, IX, 350, ch. 6, 374, ch. 83, 451, ch. 155; X, 80, ch. 4, 134, ch. 87, 166, ch. 23, 179, ch. 62, 224, ch. 188, 225, ch. 191.

20. Ibid, X, 225, ch. 191.

21. Eastham, 1722. Ibid, X, 173, ch. 43. 19 June 1722; Marblehead, 1715. Ibid, IX, 426, ch. 107. The religious situation in southeastern Massachusetts resulted in a similar arrangement for Rehoboth because of the presence of many Baptists in one of the precincts. Mass. Archives, XI, 387; Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 165, ch. 138, 241, ch. 27.

22. Salem, 1712. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 258, ch. 82, 261,

ch. 93.

23. Lynn, 1718/19. Ibid, IX, 640, ch. 131.

24. Springfield and West Springfield, 1695--1705. Mass. Archives, XI, 128, 170, 177, 180, 181, 182, 196; Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 349, ch. 33, 369, ch. 6; VIII, 120, ch. 10.

25. Plymouth, 1695. Mass. Archives, XI, 97--98, 100; Weymouth, 1722. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 220, ch. 175; Salem, 1719. Ibid, IX, 687, ch. 94; Ipswich, 1715--1720. Ibid, IX and X, passim.

26. Dorchester, 1721/22. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 132, ch. 82, 468, ch. 102, 500, ch. 197.

27. Ibid, IX, 621, ch. 8, 678, ch. 73.

28. Ibid, IX, 289, ch. 16, 418, ch. 87; X, 230, ch. 205.

29. There was also some question whether a communicant who belonged within the limits of some other town or precinct and hence paid no ministerial tax for the benefit of his own church should have power to vote in calling a minister. The matter came up for decision in 1735 and was decided in the negative, when the House of Representatives resolved "that no person in communion with any church and dwelling without the limits of the town or precinct to which such church belongs, and by which town or precinct cannot be rated or taxed for the support of their minister, hath, nor ever had nor ought to have any vote or power of acting in inviting, calling, supporting, continuing, or separating from such minister, or any other affair that may affect the interest or charge of any town or precinct." Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 108.

-30- "Now they proceed unto a Salary, to be offered unto the Minister, whom they have chosen. [To which there is usually added somewhat also, which they call, A Settlement, in order to some Sub-

sistence of his Family, in case he dy among them.]" C. Mather, Ratio Disciplinae, 19.

31. In creating a township in 1717 the proviso which the General Court included in the order ran,--"provided they have there at least forty families settled there with an orthodox Minister within the space of three years, and that a Lott and other accommodations as large and convenient as may be the Place will admit of in the Judgment of said committee be laid out to the first settled Minister, Also a Lott for the Ministry and an other for the Use of the School." Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 548, ch. 79.

32. Suffield, 1702/03, 1703. Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 370, ch. 11; VIII, 17, ch. 24.

33. Ibid, X, 249, ch. 264.

34. Ibid, VIII, 779.

35. Mass. Archives, XI, 276; Mass. Prov. Laws, IX,30, ch.74.

36. Mass. Prov. Laws, VIII, 253, ch. 84. 28 Nov. 1707; IX, 19, ch. 41, 30 June 1708; VIII, 776--793. Another famous example of the supervision of the authorities over the settlement of ministers appears in the history of Watertown, 1722. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 196, ch. 99, 221, ch. 176.

37. The address of Gov. Bellomont to the Council and Assembly in May 1700 included this exhortation: "I recommend to your care the ministers in the remote parts of the Province who have narrow stipends." Cal. St. Papers, 1700, 485.

38. Mass. Prov. Laws, VII, 34, ch. 10.

39. Ibid, VII, 88, ch. 43.

40. Ibid, VII, 160, ch. 28.

41. Ibid, VII, 202, ch. 53.

42. Ibid, VII, 304, ch. 49.

43. Ibid, VII, 222, ch. 19.

44. Ibid, VII, 222, ch. 19.

45. Ibid, VII, 247, ch. 22, 252, ch. 41, 304, ch. 49, 341, ch. 16; VIII, 36, ch. 77, 78, 69, ch. 14; IX, 213, ch. 120, 241, ch. 26.

46. Ibid, VIII, 36, ch. 77, 78.

47. Ibid, IX, 395, ch. 25.

48. Ibid, IX, 537, ch 45, 589, ch. 1, 626, ch. 98; X, 9, ch. 10, 80, ch. 3, 199, ch. 109, 303, ch. 36, 448, ch. 45, 558, ch. 368, 592, ch. 43.

49. Ibid, X, 377, ch. 275, 378, ch. 279, 462, ch. 84, 599, ch. 63.

50. Ibid, X, 172, ch. 41, 725, ch. 422.

51. Ibid, VII, 113, ch. 17, 168, ch. 49.

52. Ibid, VII, 197, ch 36, 311, ch. 68; VIII, 41, ch. 90, 126, ch. 29, 259, ch. 101; IX, 36, ch.89, 86, ch. 90, 121, ch.7, 146, ch. 83, 366, ch. 64.

53. Ibid, VII, 168, ch. 47.

54. Ibid, VIII, 99, ch. 96.

55. Ibid, VII, 197, ch. 37, 346, ch. 27; VIII, 34,ch. 74, 143, ch. 69, 201, ch. 100, 246, ch. 55; IX, 38, ch. 100, 252, ch. 65, 303, ch. 62, 377, ch. 96.

56. Ibid, VII, 113, ch. 16.

57. Ibid, VIII, 35, ch. 75.

58. Ibid, VIII, 84, ch. 55.

59. Ibid, VIII, 143, ch. 68.

60. Ibid, VIII, 180, ch. 44.

61. Ibid, VIII, 209, ch. 126.

62. Ibid, VIII, 242, ch. 43; IX, 38, ch. 98, 148, ch. 93; 238, ch. 13; 252, ch. 63.

63. Ibid, IX, 604, ch. 38; X, 533, ch. 287. A much earlier grant was made in 1701 of fifteen pounds for the payment of a garrison chaplain who had served at Northfield in the time of Sir Edmund Andros. Ibid, VII, 303, ch. 46.

64. Ibid, VII, 173, ch. 60, 17 Dec. 1697.

65. Ibid, X, 699, ch. 341, 8 Dec. 1725.

66. Ibid, VII, 293, ch. 23, 26 June 1701; IX, 533, ch. 33, 18 June 1717, 597, ch. 22, 18 June 1718.

67. Ibid, VIII, 118, ch. 5, 8 June 1705.

68. In 1700 Wrentham secured the remitting of twenty pounds of her province rate of 1696. Ibid, VII, 633. In 1703 the province treasurer was directed to order Wells and York to pay their minister the sums of fifteen and ten pounds respectively of the province tax last levied on those towns. Ibid, VIII,36,ch.77,78.

69. In 1724 permission was given Rutland to tax her unimproved land towards the support of the ministry. Ibid, X, 532, ch.284. Similar orders were issued for Enfield, Hopkinton and Scarborough. Ibid, X, 479, ch. 136, 450, ch. 51, 378, ch. 279. The taxing of non-resident proprietors had been resorted to in the colonial period. Mass. Archives, XI, 13--14. Worcester and Oxford came under this ruling in 1716 and 1718. Mass. Prov. Laws, X,318,ch.82.

70. House Journal, 1720, 3.

71. Salem Mo. M., passim.

72. Essex Sessions.

73. Pembroke Mo. M., passim.

74. The records of the Court of General Sessions of the Peace for the County of Barnstable are not in existence.

75. Sandwich Mo. M., passim.

76. Mass. Archives, XI, 256, 257.

77. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 292, ch. 27.

78. Champion of "enforced maintenance", though his work has not survived. Chalkley, Answer to Metcalf.

79. This difficulty regarding paper money which many other ministers soon encountered became so acute by 1724 that the General Court was obliged to consider the matter. The report of a committee from this body recommended that a law be made to compel every parish to make up to its minister an amount equal to the difference, the County Court to determine how much the currency had depreciated. While this report did not become law, a resolve was passed recommending it to every town and precinct, this resolve to be read in every congregation on the next Lord's day and in the parish meetings of the following March. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 563, ch. 385.

80. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 673, ch. 56. The organization of this fund seems to be the cause for the cessation of grants from the public treasury to the ministry throughout the province. Freetown was voted its benefaction in the same year. House Journal, 1719, 1.

81. "As to the Case of ye Church of Tivertone Swanzey ffreeton and little Compton in ye whole of these I believe there may be betwixt 2 or 300 people that are Church people & are resolved never to have any other Minister, but a Church Minister unless the Government of ye Collony of Massachusetts under whose Government they are) force and [sic] independant upon them, wch they have done in ffreetown already, & will in the rest if their is not a Missionary Sent to take possess-

ion of that Church built in Tivertone." Stewart to Nicholson, 12 Feb. 1719/20, S.P.G.Letters, A XIV, 162.

82. Bicknell, Barrington, 133, 179, 201.

83. Bristol Sessions, I, 13.

84. Ibid, I, 15.

85. Ibid, I, 17, 19.

86. Ibid, I, 121, 129; Bicknell, Barrington, 139--141.

87. Bristol Sessions, I, 133.

88. The result of the negotiations was the coming of John Fisk to Swansea in the office of Congregational minister but so bitter was the feeling between the two sects in the town that trouble continued. One of the means taken by the Baptist selectmen to rid the town of Fisk was to issue a warrant to the constable "Requiring him in her Majties Name to warn John Fisk to depart the Town in fourteen days time &c." C.O., 5, 865. The constable, knowing that Fisk belonged in none of the classes of undesirable persons included under the law of ejectment, appealed to the Quarter Sessions for advice. The latter discharged him from serving the warrant, summoned the selectmen and admonished them for this "Illegal & unpresidential" conduct. Bristol Sessions, II, 150, 151, 155; Dudley to the Board of Trade, 1 March 1708/9, C.O.5, 913, 114, 115; "Memorial of the ministers of Bristol County to the General Assembly", Oct. 1711, Mass. Archives, XI, 385.

89. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 180, ch. 22, 201, ch. 78, 249, ch. 50, 548, ch. 78, 563, ch. 114.

90. Bristol Sessions, III,A, 59, 61; Backus, Baptists, I, 499.

91. Bristol Sessions, I, 15.

92. Bristol Sessions, I, 17, 19, 21. In January 1702 the selectmen of Tiverton presented to Bristol Sessions a paper pleading for "a Liberty of Conscience in the Exercise of Religion as a Priviledge granted by their Majestyes Charter and Recipting Several Passages out of the Province laws. Referring to the Priviledges of Churches the Quallifications choise and Settlement of ministers." Bristol Sessions, I, 38.

93. Ibid, II, 20, 23, 47.

94. Ibid, II, 47.

95. Ibid, II, 93.

96. Ibid, II, 98; Mass. Archives, XI, 231; Potter, First Cong. Soc. of New Bedford, 101.

97. Bristol Sessions, II, 104.

98. Ibid, II, 107.

99. Increase Mather, in his Discourse concerning the Maintenance Due to those That Preach the Gospel, Boston, 1706, p. 57, writes,--"It is a doleful thing, that there should be Towns in New-England, able to Support the Preaching of the Gospel, and yet not one man found therein willing to give Entertainment to a Minister of Christ."

100. Bristol Sessions, II, 113.

101. Ibid, II, 116; Mass. Archives, XI, 231; Potter, First Cong. Soc. of New Bedford, App. A, 102.

102. Potter, First Cong. Soc. of New Bedford, App. A, 100; Mass. Archives, XI, 230--231, contains the original papers.

103. Mass. Archives, XI, 320.

104. Old Dartmouth Hist. Soc. Colls., No. 3, p.9.

105. Potter, First Cong. Soc. of New Bedford, 17 note. Bristol Sessions, though now relieved of responsibility, continued

to interest herself in her delinquent towns. It was Tiverton which reminded the Court "that the Case Reffering to a mister was laid before the great and generall Court and therefore thought it hard measure to be presented & sent for from Court to Court." The General Sessions saw the justice of this plea and decided that the "prsons & Case by [sic] dismist till the mind of the sd great and generall Assembly be ffurther known." The same was decided in the case of Dartmouth. Bristol Sessions, II, 128.

106. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 9, ch. 8; II, 269; IX, 17, ch. 36.

107. Potter, First Cong. Soc. of New Bedford, App. A, 104.

108. Dartmouth Mo. M.,, 43.

109. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 47, ch. 124; Dartmouth Mo. M., 46--48.

110. Potter, First Cong. Soc. of New Bedford, 20, 25, App. A, 110; Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 42, ch. 112.

111. Mass. Archives, XI, 293.

112. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 109, ch. 162, 114, ch. 175, 224, ch. 153, 434, ch. 123, 492, ch. 95; X, 177, ch. 56; II, 269; Potter, First Cong. Soc. of New Bedford, App. A, 106--107.

113. Mass. Archives, XI, 320; Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, ch. 168.

114. Mass. Archives, XI, 293.

115. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 70, ch. 42; II, 269.

116. Mass. Archives, XI, 304. Danforth made another plea for Tiverton in the memorial presented by the ministers of Bristol County to the General Assembly in 1711. Mass. Archives, XI, 385.

117. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 131, ch. 42, 166, ch. 141.

118. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 95.

119. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 249, ch. 54.

120. Bristol Sessions, II, 203; III A, 4, 7, 10; III B, 9, 302, 311; Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 177, ch. 57. In 1724 the Bristol Court was wearily agreeing to ask the General Assembly if it might not accept the Quaker Joseph Wanton of Tiverton as the minister of the town. Bristol Sessions, III B, 9.

121. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 572, ch. 140. The representatives of the S.P.G. felt great resentment at such proceedings. "They are endeavouring from Boston to Introduce an Independent Minister to Tiverton. I should have been very glad they had been prevented by a Missionary from England and I hope it is not yet too late." Honeyman to the Secretary, 15 May 1718, S.P.G. Letters, B XIII, 503--504. The inefficacy of these attempts is expressed by an exaggerated statement in another of Honeyman's letters. "In Little Compton there is an Independent Teacher, and now and then one in Freetown, but in Tivertownnever Any." Honeyman to the Secretary, 7 Sept. 1727, S.P.G. Papers, B I, No. 222.

122. Bristol Sessions, III A, 33.

123. Ibid, I, 15, 18.

124. Fowler, Fall River, 39.

125. Bristol Sessions, II, 113.

126. Ibid, II, 131, 136, 140, 141.

127. Ibid, II, 141.

128. Mass. Archives, XI, 291. The names of the more important freeholders of Freetown are absent from the list of signers of this petition.

129. "Some of them," Danforth wrote, "give Encouragem 't that if they could have twenty pounds allowed to a Preacher among them for two or three yeer, they should & would Rayse among them-

selves so much more as would be Competent to subsist a minister there & severall who decline to sign the Petition out of a little humor, Yett promise they will do theyr parts Equivalent in proportion to any of the Petitioners for subsisting a minister whensoever this Court shall send one among them: I do humbly pray that this Court would make a tryall of their Ingenuity by allowing twenty pounds for one yeer to such a minister whom this Court shall appoint for them." Mass. Archives, XI, 304.

130. In addition to the twenty pounds allotted in 1709 the General Court voted at the end of a year a sum "after the rate of twenty pounds per annum to Mr. Joseph Avery, for each Sabbath, he hath or shall preach at Freetown." Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 166, ch. 142, 195, ch. 63, 249, ch. 53, 299, ch. 52, 361, ch. 44, 409, ch. 67, 502, ch. 124, 561, ch. 107.

131. Mass. Archives, XI, 369.

132. Bristol Sessions, II, 214, 219, 220; IIIB, 43(insert), 37(insert), 43, 63, 64. "The Conditions of several Churches, calls for my most exquisite Care, to gett them delivered out of their Temptation.

Moreover I must gett that Matter well settled; the ordaining of Ministers whom we send unto places destitute of the Gospel; and empowering of them to act as Ministers. Freetown particularly should be accommodated in this matter. " 7 Mass. Hist. Colls., VIII, 232, Cotton Mather's Diary, 23 Aug. 1713.

133. Stewart to Nicholson, 12 Feb. 1719/20, S.P.G. Letters, A XIV, 162.

134. Backus, Baptists, I, 500. Neal observed (New England, II, 250--251) of the Massachusetts custom that "in the Countries,

the Minister contracts with his People for a certain Stipend, which is usually but small, and very indifferently paid. The Minister indeed has his Remedy at Law against Defaulters, but if he should sue any of his Parishoners, he must bid adieu to his Preaching at that Place."

135. Bristol Sessions, III B, 64, 65; House Journal, 1719, 12, 13, 18, 23, 24.

136. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 70, ch. 156.

137. Ibid, X, 291, ch. 12, 305, ch. 42, 330, ch. 119.

138. Bristol Sessions, III B 122, 129, 132, 198, 212.

139. Fowler, Fall River, 43; Hurd, Bristol County, 297.

140. Bristol Sessions, I, 19, 21.

141. Ibid, I, 25, 27, 36; II, 4, 14.

142. Ibid, II, 25.

143. Ibid, II, 28. At this point the constables were sued by the treasurers. C.O. 5, 864.

144. Bristol Sessions, II, 90. One influence brought to bear upon the settlemant of a minister at Little Compton was the Society for the Propagation of Religion, patterned upon the similar societies in England. Edward Bromfield to the Secretary, 24 Feb. 1707, S.P.G. Letters, A III, 178.

145. Bristol Sessions, I, 15, 17; II, 93, 113, 116.

146. Daggett, Attleborough, 226 and note.

147. In point of time compare the rejection in Massachusetts of the Proposals of 1705 with the ecclesiastical law of 1706.

CHAPTER V.

THE QUAKERS AND THEIR ALLIES.

The three religious bodies which, during the first half of the eighteenth century, were carrying on a consistent opposition to the Massachusetts ecclesiastical system, were the Quakers, the Baptists and the Church of England. In this opposition the Anglican Church stood apart, basing most of its arguments on its own position as the established church of the mother country. The Baptists and Quakers very early joined forces in their common demand against the legal recognition of one sect over another. During the latter half of the century the Baptists were the stronger group and the leaders; before 1740 the Quakers held this position. This exchange in influence was merely the accompaniment of the exchange in numerical strength which the two bodies experienced during the second quarter of the century.

In their decline the Quakers of New England were suffering the fate which early came to the society in both the old and the new world. The Baptists of New England were gainers at the expense of the Quakers, and likewise of the Congregationalists, the "separate" churches, which dated from the Great Awakening, in many cases becoming Baptist. The fact that the Quakers were doing before 1740 the same work which the Baptists continued after that date has never been fully recognized. This would not have been the case if like the Baptists they had produced an historian.[1] It is true that at one time Moses Brown of Providence, contemporary and friend of Isaac Backus, was contemplating a history of New England Quakerism, but he never went farther than to collect some

material.[2] The situation was not to be changed by the typical New England historiansof the nineteenth century. Interested primarily in those elements in the community which were represented in the General Court they underestimated the influence of other forces.[3]

The Quakers of the eighteenth century had left behind them the period of persecution and now enjoyed both in England and in the Colonies a power quite out of proportion to their numerical strength. This influence was due to their position as the smaller group of a great body, organized and centralized, still warm with religious enthusiasm, and including among its members many influential men. The weekly, monthly and quarterly meetings of New England, centering in the great yearly meeting at Rhode Island, were only the repetition of the same organization in the Quaker colonies and in England. Communication between the various yearly meetings was constant, the London Yearly Meeting taking a supervising interest in all.[4] The "Meeting for Sufferings," which was organized in London, received the complaints not only of all the smaller meetings in England, but from Quakerism wherever it had been established.

The method used by the English Quakers of recording their sufferings with the purpose of carrying them before local meetings and thence to London was a well recognized custom in New England several years before the date of the province charter.
In Massachusetts these sufferings were of three kinds,- fines and distraint or imprisonment for 1.) refusal to train with the militia or go with a military expedition; 2.) refusal to take any oath of office or for service on a jury; 3.) refusal to pay the rate for

the Congregational minister or to assess or collect such a rate in the office of selectman, assessor or constable. With the last mentioned we are chiefly concerned as it alone affected the individual churches in their relation to the civil government.

As early as 1677 the Salem Monthly Meeting proposed that "Care might be taken in ye buseness relating to friends Sufferings" which were to"be recorded, and Coppies thereof sent to Rodisland."[5] The recommendation had probably come from the Yearly Meeting which has no extant records for so early a period. In 1683 the Yearly Meeting desired "that due Care be taken by friends in their respective meetings to record all their Sufferings, and by whome they Suffered, the time when, the manner how, and the Cause why they Suffered, and to bring them to the next Yearly meeting att Rodisland."[6] The method here recommended for recording sufferings was the one adopted by the monthly meetings throughout New England, they communicating it to their weekly meetings.[7] Though an occasional reminder proved necessary the yearly reports were duly carried to Rhode Island and thence dispatched with the yearly epistle to the London Friends.[8]

The next step was taken in 1692 when the Yearly Meeting arranged for a special gathering on certain days, early in the morning, before the time for the public meeting for worship, at which representatives from the several meetings were to bring in their accounts of sufferings "if Aney Bee."[9] At these little special "meetings for sufferings" it became customary to call the roll by monthly meetings at which time the reports were given and recorded.[10]

In 1701 the Yearly Meeting drew up a list of "Some Queries to Bee made at Quarterly and monthly meetings," covering all phases of Quaker life and doctrine, for the purpose of bringing the weaker communities into line. Among these were three relating to sufferings:-

"9 Are friends Cearfull to Bring in thear Sufferings for Truths Testamoney, yt theye may Bee Recorded.

10 Wheather ffriends doe Keepe up Truths Testamoney; agaynst Bearing of armes & Trayning; & Things of that nature --

11. How doe are ffriends Keep Theare testamoney to ye Truth in Refusing to paye to ye maintainance of ye heyerling minestry-"[11]

Five years later, feeling that the collecting and recording of sufferingsmight well have more attention, the Yearly Meeting appointed a committee of two or three prominent men for each of the four quarterly meetings in existence at that time, to handle the matter and bring in exact accounts. "ffriends are Desird," ran the resolution, "to take Ceare in Bringing in theare Sufferings to Each Quarterly meeting & take notis of ye Daye of ye month & the yeare, and also ye name of ye person that grants fforth the Warant and the names of ye persons that takes awaye theare goods and the use ffor what it is taken wheather Priest or others with the name of ye place wheare the ffriends Liveth and all ye persons above named and the some Demanded & ye vallew of what is taken."[12] This increasing solicitude of the Yearly Meeting was shown also in the purchase of a book for the recording of sufferings and the appointment of an official recorder.[13]

While the Quakers insisted strongly upon resistance to the payment of taxes in certain cases, they were on the whole law-abiding citizens, the various meetings using their influence to accomplish this result. The Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting was in 1705 much distressed by complaints that certain Friends "Eastward" refused to pay any public taxes to the government on the ground that a great part of the money was used for war. A paper was drawn up on the subject and travelling Friends were asked to urge Hampton and Dover people to pay the rates.[14]

Resistance to taxation for an established church was one of the first rules of the Quaker body. Recording of sufferings was very early an important duty of the individual Friend. The first record we have of a deliberate decision on the part of a New England meeting to raise the question of the legal right of the government to exact ministerial taxes, belongs to the Monthly Meeting held at Lynn on January 10,1697/98. At this time a letter was written to London describing the sufferings of the Quakers in that region,- more intense than in the southern country of Bristol, because the Quaker element was here more completely overpowered by the standing order,- and inquiring "Whether the Presbiterian Clergye have power to sue for Tythes." The London Meeting for Sufferings which took up this case agreed that the correspondents for New England should investigate the matter, to discover whether any laws which might be made in New England could empower the "presbiterians to sue for Tythes and cast people into prison."[15] Application was immediately made in the form of queries to two English lawyers, for a legal statement of opinion.[16] Their reply is important as the first such statement obtained by either Quaker or Anglican body

in its struggle against the Massachusetts church-state system.

"Query 1 Whether Presbiterian Ministers not being Inducted according to the Cannons of the Church of England, have power to sue for, Distrain and cast into prison, Persons yt refuse to pay the Tax of the Country made in January, 1693. in the Towne of Lyn in New England.

Answer Unless there is a Law in the Country Confirmed in England to Justifye it, I conceive they cannot; for a Presbiterian Minister is a Person not taken of in our Law, and if he was the Law of England doth not warrant such proceedings; I find by the Warrant to the Constable his behaviour in this Case -

Q: 2 Which way ye Person so Prosecuted distrained or Imprisoned may be Relieved agst the said Law or Prosecution aforesaid.

Ans: The Person so prosecuted If his goods were distrained may bring a Replevin or Action of Trover for Recovery of them: If he is Imprisoned he may bring an Action of ffalse Imprisonmt or an Habeous Corpus ye Cause of his Committment appearing on return thereof, a Judge ought to discharge him his Committmt being Illegal.

Q:3 Whether any of the Country Laws of the Said New England made by their select men yt are repugnant to the Laws of England can be Lawfully Imposed upon the Inhabitants thereof.

Answer I Presume by their select men, they mean their Assembly, If so I take it yt no Law yt is made by them yt is repugnant to the Law of England will bind the Inhabitants Unless it be Transferred to England and there confirmed.

J. Scroope

I am of the same opinion with Mr Scroope
Tho: Newton -"[17]

On the strength of this statement the London Friends now wrote to the New Englanders urging them to try a test case and if local judgment proved unsatisfactory, to carry the suit to the proper court in England.[18] Here was the first suggestion of the later appeal to the King in Council. Further encouragement along the same line soon came to the New England Yearly Meeting from Governor Bellomont. The Lynn meeting, not yet ready for a test case, carried its difficulties to the Yearly Meeting of 1699 which appointed a committee to "consider & Draw up an Accot of fri nds Sufferingesat Linn & Yarmouth or ealswhere in order to present to ye Governer Bellomont to obtaine Reeleefe from him."[19] His reply was to call the Quakers' attention to the fact that the laws of which they complained had been confirmed in England so that he had no authority in the matter "without order from thence." He did however give the Quakers to understand that he would send their petition to England and obtain some answer for them.[20]

Although this petition never reached England Bellomont had made a contribution in his statement that the Massachusetts law had had the approval of the crown. It remained for the London friends to prove this statement to their own satisfaction and this they did through the work of investigating committees.[21] Richard Diamond and William Crouch who visited the Plantation Office at the request of the meeting, reported the esistence of the law of 1692,[22] and John Field who was shortly afterwards sent to discover whether the law had received royal approbation, reported that it had been confirmed by the King in Council.[23]

Nothing daunted the English Quakers determined to proceed farther, first taking the precautionary measure of recommending to all meetings in the various colonies that they watch their respective legislatures and give timely notice of the passage of a law if they wished to have it disallowed in England.[24] In regard to Massachusetts the London Friends observed that it might not be in accordance with the Massachusetts charter to "force maintenance to a Nonconforming Ministry dissenting from ye Church of England." If the New England Quakers were convinced that this was the case they were urged to approach the governor once more and remind him of this fact, in order that he might inform the Privy Council against the allowance of further legislation. In the meantime it would be well for them to draw up a petition directly from themselves to the king that the English Friends might solicit for them and have a stop put to further legislation.[25]

While the London Friends were waiting for a reply from New England they were investigating the various questions which had recently presented themselves. William Crouch brought from the Board of Trade information of a fact which they were already suspecting:- that when once a law made in the plantations had been allowed in England there was no other way of repealing it "but by the Assembly that made it." The meeting which received this statement appointed a committee to discover whether the law which was under consideration did "agree with the Original Patten or Governours Instructions."[26] Three months later William Crouch appeared with the Massachusetts charter, secured at the Plantation Office, and it was filed by the Meeting for Sufferings with the laws of 1692.[27] Convinced by their perusal of the charter that

laws for the support of one form of worship were not in accordance with this document and that they should be disallowed on this basis, they wrote a further letter to New England in which the Massachusetts Quakers were again urged to keep watch of their assembly and make protests before it was too late.[28]

The first suggestion made by the English Friends in their letters of 1700 - that a petition to the king be drawn, was followed by the Quakers of Lynn who in the following year produced a timid representation. It was approved in the New England Yearly Meeting and dispatched to London.[29] The Massachusetts Quakers had not yet grasped the full significance of allowance by the crown of colonial legislation and made the simple prayer that they might be eased of the imposition of tithes.[30] In recent months the London Meeting for Sufferings had been gaining a clear idea of colonial administration and recognized the fruitlessness of such a petition unless new legislation was before the Privy Council. Its only act therefore was the appointment of a committee to approach the man who should be made governor of New England and ask his moderation toward the Friends there.[31] Other matters of importance to Quakers were already occupying the attention of the London meetings and crowded out consideration of this case for the present. The sufferings of the Lynn Quakers did not again appear as a separate issue until 1705.

The assurance with which the English Quakers made promises of effective support in the case of further ecclesiastical legislation in Massachusetts was well founded. In the years following the revolution, when the Toleration Act had recognized the Quaker body with other dissenters, and further laws passed in their favor

were giving them various rights and privileges, the growing influence of these people received increasing recognition. In governmental circles this was due in large part to the importance of individuals among them who represented ability, wealth and large business interests. There has been present in the make-up of many adhering to Friends' principles, a strong business sense and financial keenness which, combined with deep religious feeling and sincerity of lofty purpose has given great material strength to the society. William Penn was himself a possessor of this characteristic. In New England it appeared conspicuously in the lives of Richard Borden and Thomas Richardson and among the English Quakers, who were backing the New England meeting at the opening of the eighteenth century, many could be mentioned. The name of William Crouch appears among the signers of a petition (29 Jan.1702/03) against granting a charter of incorporation to Sir Mathew Dudley and others for furnishing her Majesty with naval stores. It was offered on the theory that such a charter would be destructive to the trade of the provinces and be a very great prejudice to all merchants and traders to those parts, among whom the petitioners were numbered. The charter was not granted.[32] Other important Quakers were John Field, Edward Hastwell, Theodore Eccleston and Joseph Wyeth, and in later years John Gurney,[33] Thomas Hyam[34] and Richard Partridge.[35] John Kelsall, a youngQuaker who attended the London Yearly Meeting of 1704 records in his diary a list of the noted Friends present, in which are as many names which represent public importance as stand for eminence in preaching or writing.[36]

This was the type of Englishman which had opposed William III's methods of dealing with foreign trade and economic affairs in

the colonies, calling into existence the body officially known as the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations. The first members of the Board of Trade were chosen largely to satisfy the demands of English business interests.[37] In such interests Quakers were represented, and to this fact may be due something of the close relation existing between the Board of Trade in its early history and the London Yearly Meeting. At a later date, when the Board had lost much of its early vigor and colonial affairs were in Newcastle's hands, the influence of the English Quakers in the problems of the American Friends was no less conspicuous.
In these later years the Quaker body not only continued to form a strong element in the Whig party, but included among its members several men who could command the attention of Walpole and the Duke of Newcastle.[38]

This political influence of the important Quaker leaders appears in many contests which they entered for the sake of the Friends in the colonies, just at the opening of the eighteenth century. Here may be mentioned their resistance to the Maryland tobacco act with taxation for the Church of England, opposition to the newly published Connecticut law against heretics, and their long continued struggle against the crown's attack upon proprietary governments. Though they were in these acts opposed by the Church of England, the colony of Connecticut and the general policy of the Board of Trade respectively, the Quakers were able to get unusual recognition. Two of these struggles bear an indirect relation to Massachusetts Quakerism.

In the attack on proprietary governments the Quakers of England had a two-fold fear. In the first place they foresaw the

fall at the hand of the Board of Trade of the thriving Quaker colonies of Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, and immediately sent letters to both Philadelphia and Newport to advise of the situation and urge that statements of defense be sent to England.[39] Beyond this and as a prime motive, they were convinced there was an endeavor on the part of the English bishops and clergy, especially Dr. Bray, and their "more meaner Instruments," - meaning Randolph and Bass - to secure the introduction of governmental institutions which could best be used as the civil arm for establishing the Church of England in these colonies, welcoming missionaries and collecting tithes.[40] Before them they imagined lay the same battle in these colonies that they were already waging for Maryland. It was in certain part due to the efforts of a vigorous committee of the London Meeting for Sufferings that the matter was dropped in 1701.

When the attack on the charter governments of Rhode Island and Connecticut was renewed in subsequent years the situation was changed by the presence of Joseph Dudley as governor of Massachusetts. While determined to enforce the British imperialistic policy of which he was the exponent[41] and conscious that this was impossible without great changes in the liberties of Rhode Island, he had a keen sense of the importance of the Quaker in England. His problem was to keep on good terms with a vigorous religious body, while advancing schemes for colonial control which conflicted with the political and less directly the religious interests of this sect. During his whole period of government he was remarkably successful in clearing himself from accusations made by English Quakers and in giving a distinct impression of cordiality to the New England

Friends.

On May 20, 1703 the London Yearly Meeting took notice of the revival in Connecticut of an old law against various heretics, including Quakers.[42] The New England Yearly Meeting, in sending this law with their epistle to London and begging for its "repeal", were carrying out the suggestion which the English Friends had made when, two years before, they urged the timely report of such legislation. Two distinct measures were adopted by the London Meeting for Sufferings at this time. The committee to whom the matter was assigned was not only to visit the Plantation Office, with a view to learning whether this law had yet arrived and been confirmed. It was also to acquaint the Presbyterian and Independent ministers of London of the existence of this colonial legislation.[43] The committee, upon discovering that this law was at the Plantation Office,[44] wrote a letter to the Presbyterian and to the Congregational ministers of London to ask them to join the Quakers in a petition to the Queen for disallowing such laws as were inconsistent with that liberty of conscience for which they were all supposed to stand.[45] The answer from the ministers, while acknowledging that they as well as the Quakers were for liberty of conscience everywhere, did not accept the invitation. It stated merely that both bodies were writing to the Congregationalists of New England, repeating the complaint of the Quakers, and remarked that they could not go further until obtaining a reply.[46]

The letter which was written at this time by the London Congregational ministers finally reached Increase Mather.[47] In it the writers showed a much less clear conception than the English Quakers possessed of the basis and methods of New England

legislation, as they had studied the Magnalia rather than the Plantation Office. Nevertheless, with some opening apologies, they made a strong case regarding "penal laws for matters of meer Conscience."[48]

In the meantime[49] the London Quakers grew weary of waiting for the Independents, and the Yearly Meeting of 1704 gave its approval, with financial support, to a petition which the Meeting for Sufferings had prepared and was ready to lay before the Queen in Council.[50] Succeeding meetings followed this petition in its course through Lords Committee and Board of Trade, arranged for answering Sir Henry Ashurst[51] in his defense of Connecticut and for seeking advice from William Penn. They supplied specific instances of persecution when called upon and finally, when the Order in Council had been secured, filed it with the other papers.[52]

A second attempt was made by the English Quakers to gain the support of the Nonconformists in 1705, after the receipt of the Order in Council. A committee of Quakers then visited the Independents with the invitation to join them in sending to New England the appeal that the "Tolleration act may by yt Governmt be there admitted by consent in its full force." As neither body took the steps for which the Quakers were hoping,[53] the Meeting for Sufferings independently sent off a copy of the Order in Council to the governor of Connecticut with an earnest recommendation for the future.[54]

In this question Dudley became involved through the accusation by Sir Henry Ashurst that it was he who had unearthed this bit of old legislation and published it in Boston in order to stir up in England further hostility to the government of Connecticut.[55]

While this was not a fact, the charge was a clever one as it took account of Dudley's appreciation of the importance of the Quakers and of the evidence he was already giving of a desire to propitiate them. Watching from Boston their activities in England he saw that in their first appeals they were associating Massachusetts with Connecticut in treatment of dissenting sects. He accordingly wrote (1 Jan.1703/04) to William Crouch to explain the situation, saying- "there are no Laws in ... [Massachusetts] yt Affect any persuasion of the Reformed Religion - and ... their Laws wch were formerly made agst friends are abolished."[56]

William Crouch, though convinced of Dudley's friendship, had gained, in the course of his investigations at the Plantation Office, information of the letter which Dudley had written to the Board of Trade, September 17,1702, berating severely the Quaker government of Rhode Island.[57] As a result of this discovery his answer to Dudley's letter contained a rebuke.[58]

Meanwhile the letter written to New England by the Congregational ministers of London, carrying with it a copy of the London Quakers' letter to them, had reached Increase Mather. Not long afterwards (29 October 1705) there appeared in the Boston News Letter, under the editorship of John Campbell, certain insinuations against the London Quakers based upon their letter to the Congregational ministers. The chief point here made was that the London Quakers in this letter had misrepresented the Massachusetts government, accusing it of great unfriendliness to the Quakerelement and in this including Dudley. To the London Friends this was a direct challenge from Dudley as the paper bore the usual heading, "printed by authority." John Field and Joseph Wyeth, who acted as a com-

mittee in this affair,[59] visited the Lords of Trade and secured their promise that a letter would be written to Dudley to clear the London Friends of any suspicion of opposing Dudley's government.
A letter written soon after by the Board of Trade to the governor of Massachusetts contained this statement:- "And whereas several of the Quakers here have complained to Us of a paper said to be printed at Boston by Authority, Entituled, The Boston News Letter, Dated the 29th of October last, containing reflections upon their proceedings here in England:- We think it fit to give you this notice that none of that perswasion have made any Application to this Board in reference to New England otherwise than against the forementioned Law Entituled Hereticks and that the Spreading of false News cannot but tend to the Creating of heats & Animosities amongst her Majesty's subjects."[60]

So it was that Dudley received within a few months of each other two letters which called upon him to state his position in relation to Quakerism. To each he replied:-

"To Wm.Crouch in answer to his dated the 3d $\frac{6}{m}$ 1705.

Boston ye 15th of April1706.

Sr This is the first oppertunity Since I had your kind letter and it is to thank you for your respect therein and so freely to accept your Chiding if I have deserved it, it is certain there is no Law of these Provinces in force agst any of your perswasion nor pretence thereto but they are as Easie in all points as any others to attend their own Method of Worship and I believe none of them will complain that I have not always Treated them with freedom and respect as well as Justice, but in the matter

of Road Island of wch you write it is not a Business of Religion but of a Civil Nature referring to the Jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court in which I did nothing but wt I was Expressly Commanded by her Majesty and their Refusal was agst the Law as is given for the Opinion of her Maties Councill in the Law to wch they and I ought to submitt,- however that matter is now over and need never be Rememb red or Repeated, I heartily Wish you well and shall be glad of a letter now and then from you and pray you will give my service to Mr. Pen when you may see him.

I am Sr. your very humble servt

J. Dudley:"-[61]

To the Board of Trade on October 2,1706 he wrote: -

"I am very sorry that the News Paper should give your Lordships the least disturbance referring to the Quakers here in no Law in being that reflects upon them or is grievous, saving the Military Laws, which demand Fynes for want of Service, which was made before I came hither, but has been used as moderately as I can bring to pass, There are none of that perswasion here, but will give Testimony if need were of my friendship and kind reception of them at all times,[62] and in this Matter I have reprimanded the writer, and required him to tell his News without any reflection for the future, which I am sure he will obey, and of this the Quakers here are knowing and well satisfyed."[63]

This somewhat intricate episode is of importance in the light which it throws on numerous civil and ecclesiastical questions. Dudley appears as the exponent of the British imperialistic policy, ready to carry out the wishes of the authority which he represented but with a certain tactfulness which meant the placating rather than the disturbing of religious interests. The London Quakers give marked evidence of their constant support of the smaller groups in Congregational New England and of their ability to enlist the government in their behalf; the Congregational and Presbyterian ministers of London in their few utterances show how little sympathy and understanding remained between themselves and the established dissent of New England.

During the progress of these events the Quakers of Massachusetts had not been idle. Though interested primarily in the Massachusetts legislation[64] the Lynn Quakers threw themselves heartily into resistance of the Connecticut heretic law, and the New England meetings together sent twenty-four [illegible] to aid in securing its disallowance.[65] In 1706 the London Meeting for Sufferings was beginning to take up with the Board of Trade the further disabilities of the New England Quakers in both Connecticut and Massachusetts but were for a time delayed by the Connecticut agent.[66] At this moment events occurred in Massachusetts which roused all the little meetings and carried the center of the struggle back to the New England shore.

The immediate cause of the rising of the little meetings of Massachusetts at just this time was the law of November 14, 1706. The weekly meeting which especially stirred itself was that of Little Compton whose relations with Bristol Court of General Ses-

sions were somewhat strained. This meeting, with an appeal to the Governor in mind, on December 3,1706, applied to the Rhode Island Monthly Meeting of which it was a member, but the latter suggested that it would be better to delay matters until "sufferings were better put in order," and a concerted action possible.[67] The proposal here hinted was not allowed to drop.

Representatives from Rhode Island Monthly now carried the idea to the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting and there urged that all Friends be instructed to collect their sufferings "Especially wt is taken for ye Priest." Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting approved, and Richard Borden was chosen to "send to ye other monthly or Quarterly meeting in Newengland to doe ye like; & So to bring in order Sd Sufferings to Rhoad Island yearly meeting yt friends may fairly Apeal to ye Masetusus Governer & So for England if Acation be for Releaf."[68]

Salem Quarterly Meeting was the next to consider the situation. On April 7,1707 it was ordered that some of its principal members send to England the law "lately mad for ye maintananc of there Priests" and all others of like nature, and appointed Samuel Collins and Walter Newbury to "acquaint ye Govenar of ye Sd Laws and there intentions before they send it for England."[69]

This committee, obedient to instructions, took up the task immediately, but the occurrence of the Yearly Meeting two months later made it possible for them, by carrying the matter to Rhode Island, to broaden their appeal, so as to involve a large part of the Quakers in Massachusetts, though Richard Borden's independent work in the limits of the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting was not included. The Yearly Meeting ordered the gathering of "an account

of friends Sufferings ffor not paying the priest Ever since Governor Dudley hath Beene present governor for Reliefe and that to Bee done by the ffirst 2d daye of the next month and send in the Same to Walter Newberry, in order ffor him & Saml Collings to Laye before ye Governor ffor Releiefe."[70]

The work of Newbury and Collins when finally completed comprised a petition and a paper entitled:- "A True Accompt of the sufferings of the People Called Quakers. In divers parts of this her Majtys Colony of New England. for consienciously refusing to pay towards the Maintenance of their Priests."[71] It included the various recorded instances of distraint and imprisonment for priest's rates belonging chiefly to the towns of the Salem Quarterly Meeting, Lynn, Salisbury, Haverhill, Amesbury and Kittery with a few entries for Falmouth and Mendon of the Sandwich Quarterly. The sufferings of the Lynn Quakers in 1705 and 1706 were estimated at £ 71. 6/.5d. The accompanying petition, reminded the governor and council of their power to block this oppressive legislation and warned them that unless something were done at Boston for the relief of Quakers, application would surely be carried to England.[72]

While Dudley had no grudge against the Quakers the Council was not very friendly. The cause had not yet become a vital issue. A delay was voted and objections raised. No promises were made.[73]

Immediately after this, difficulties in Bristol County became so acute that the Salem committee became unimportant and interest settled on the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting for which Richard Borden was at work. The execution of the law of 1706 did, as we have seen, particularly affect the Quakers in the towns of Dartmouth and Tiverton, but it was not until September 1708 that

their affairs were taken up systematically by the society. At that time in the Dartmouth Monthly Meeting the "business concerning the Rate which is required of this town by the General Court or Assembly at Boston, part of which rate is supposed to be for the maintenance of a hireling priest" was referred to the Quarterly Meeting at Rhode Island and John Tucker was sent to Boston with a petition from the Dartmouth Friends to be laid before the governor.[74] In the following meeting Tucker reported that he had been at Boston but had not been able to get a satisfactory answer.[75]

In the meantime the Rhode Island Monthly Meeting had begun consideration of the similar situation at Tiverton, that town lying within its boundaries. The law of 1706 was denounced and a committee appointed to inform the governor in writing of the "detriment to Friends" caused by the law. It was to request relief and, should its petition be disregarded, threaten an address to the Queen.[76] At the following meeting Richard Borden reported that he and Joseph Wanton had delivered the paper as ordered and had received from Dudley a verbal answer to the effect that they should have a hearing before the General Court. In this message there was nothing sufficiently encouraging to deter the meeting from ordering more lines, this time to be presented to the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting, that with its sanction they might be sent to the governor as a second appeal.[77]

The two monthly meetings of Dartmouth and Rhode Island had made their independent appeals to Governor Dudley. Both had likewise referred the matter to the Rhode Island Quarterly in which they were represented. This meeting accepted its task and went

promptly to work appointing Ebenezer Slocum "for to Speake with ye Govener of ye Masathuset Bay, in behalf of ffri nds Concerning the Great oppres ion ytt Is Likely to fall upon ffri nds In ytt Colloney by ye Priests Raits being Joyned In with ye gineral Publick Tax."[78] This petition did little more than repeat what the Rhode Island Monthly Meeting had already written.[79]

Ebenezer Slocum found Dudley willing to give him a personal interview and distinctly friendly, as he had proved in his conversation with Borden and Wanton. While the governor was not able to effect any improvement in the situation, the lower house standing firm to the law of 1706, he took matters into his own hands to the extent of including in a letter to the Board of Trade a review of events in Dartmouth and Tiverton with an expression of personal opinion. "I thought it my Duty," he wrote, "to Acquaint Your Lordships herewith, Expecting a Complaint thereupon, I am sorry for their Suffering though it be not upon the head of Religion, and am also sorry that they would be Assessors of the Tax to bring themselves into trouble, they think it hard to be Taxed to the Maintenance of the Ministry, and if those yt are Strictly of their profession were quitted it would be no great loss but it is Expected that if such an Indulgence be given, a great many will profess themselves Quakers, to quit themselves of this charge, as they have done from bearing Arms, and Many Villages in the Country would be left without any Publick Worship on the Lords Day. I humbly offer it to Your Lordships Consideration having no Interest in the Matter, but that Religion may be Maintained."[80]

The petition of 1708, though failing to secure any relief to the Quakers, had gained something in this letter of Dudley's.

Two other results accompanied it. The Quakers, convinced that nothing could be done through the local government, decided to carry out their alternative and make a vigorous application home to England to prevent the allowance of the law of 1706,[81] while the General Court, foreseeing this action, proceeded to draw up a memorial to be laid before the Queen justifying this legislation.[82] This lengthly document which is a handbook of Massachusetts ecclesiastical orthodoxy had practically no effect.[83]

The petition from the Quakers to the Queen, which was the third result of their solicitations at Boston in 1708, was temporarily delayed. The petition to the governor from the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting had failed and the following month saw the seizure by the sheriff of Bristol County and imprisonment at Bristol gaol of the neglectful assessors, Richard Borden of Tiverton and Thomas Taber and Deliverance Smith of Dartmouth.[84] At this the Rhode Island Monthly Meeting of November 30, 1708, decided to give the governor one more chance, but in case he failed to answer their requests, the Quakers declared, "then this meeting Doth Continue... to write to the Queen."[85] At the following meeting the petition to the Queen was read, and ordered sent to England.[86]

This petition which reached London in the spring of the following year was given careful consideration by the Meeting for Sufferings. It was agreed however that instead of addressing the Queen it would be well to write once more to the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers of London.[87] A meeting between the delegation from the London Meeting for Sufferings, headed by John Field, and the Congregational ministers occurred in the latter part of November 1709 and gave the Quakers good cause for encouragement.

From the discussion which took place they were once more convinced that the English nonconformists had very little feeling of sympathy for their brethren in New England and "seemed Inclined to be Assisting to friends in Endeavouring to get yt Law Repealed wch friends complain of."[88] At a meeting in the following month the Quakers received the offer from the Congregationalists to write once more to New England urging that the annoyances of which the Quakers complained, might cease.[89]

Whether or not the dissenting ministers carried out their promise as they had on a previous occasion, an even more effective measure was taken by Jeremiah Dummer at this time agent for Massachusetts. In consequence of the lengthy memorial from the General Court to the Board of Trade and the action in the London Quaker meetings which might end in a petition to the Queen, he wrote to Samuel Sewall, at this time a member of the governor's council in Massachusetts and Judge of the Superior Court at Boston. In this letter he reminded Sewall of the ill name which Massachusetts magistrates had with the government for their many independent actions, and suggested that the Queen would have little sympathy with dissenters for giving severe treatment to Quakers and Baptists who were looked upon in England as equal with the Presbyterians and Independents under the Toleration Act.[90]

The chief reason why the Quakers did not apply to the Privy Council in 1709 was that the very meeting which received the Rhode Island Monthly Meeting's petition learned also of the liberation of the imprisoned assessors. After dispatching to London their petition to the Queen the monthly meetings of New England proceeded to take what measures they could for the immediate relief of

the imprisoned assessors. The Dartmouth Monthly Meeting of January 17,1708/09 sent John Tucker to Boston to ask for the release of the prisoners[91] and the results of his efforts were most satisfactory. Between the years 1706 and 1714 Tiverton was regularly, with the exception of the present year, assessed the sum of £ 170 while Dartmouth was rated for an amount varying between £ 345 and £ 370. The charges for 1708-1709, of £ 200 and £ 437 11/ respectively showed therefore a ministerial rate of £ 30 for Tiverton and about 60 for Dartmouth. The selectmen not only failed to assess the £ 100 extra but declined to have anything to do with the whole rate. Their imprisonment was therefore legal even without the ecclesiastical legislation of 1706. Through a compromise now effected the assessors of Tiverton agreed to assess the town's regular rates and the additional tax was removed "for the present."[92] In the case of Dartmouth the two assessors were unexpectedly discharged.[93]

The probable explanation of these events appears in a vote of the New England Yearly Meeting which soon occurred. Richard Borden and Thomas Cornell were appointed to write to Governor Dudley "a sallutation of Respects and acknowledgments of his severall ffavors and Kindnesses shewed unto our ffriends."[94] The Governor of Massachusetts had in his attitude toward the Quakers in his province expressed the general policy of the Board of Trade as well as what was probably his own personal sympathy. It is significant that the next serious troubles between the Massachusetts authorities and the Quakers of Dartmouth and Tiverton did not occur until after the death of Queen Anne and the removal of Dudley.

In 1715, the year of Lieutenant-Governor William Tailer's authority, the Quakers became much concerned upon learning that the Massachusetts Church was taking means to secure governmental sanction for holding a synod, as had been done in the days of the colony. In this attempt the New England Yearly Meeting saw on the part of the ministers a determination to have the Congregational Church receive more legal recognition. To them it seemed that an act of the legislature giving the right to hold such a synod, upon receiving royal allowance, would make the Congregational Church the true established church of Massachusetts, like "Presbitery ... in North Britain,"[95] as they argued it had never really been. A memorial from the Congregational ministers was before the upper house on May 31 when it was voted by the councilors "That the Synod and Assembly above-mentioned, is agreeable to them, and the Reverend Ministers, are Desired to take their own time for the said Assembly."[96] On June 1 it was concurred in by the Representatives. The Yearly Meeting which now opened its session appointed a committee to watch the progress of the ministers' memorial and if necessary, inform the London correspondents, that they might prevent the allowance of any such law.[97] The London Meeting for Sufferings upon receiving this information, was on the alert[98] but action was unnecessary as Increase Mather opposed the synod in an address to the House of Representatives[99] and it was never authorized.

The law of November 14,1706 was enacted for seven years only. If the English crown had seen fit to order it disallowed when addressed in 1708, or if the Massachusetts General Court had been willing to let it lapse when its time was run out, the stirring events among the Quakers which began once more in 1717 and culmi-

nated in an appeal to the Privy Council in 1723 would never have occurred. The legislation of 1706 was practically repeated in 1715, and the law of 1715 was reenacted in 1722. While the legislation of 1715 continued the chief provisions of the law of 1706 it was not followed as in 1708 by a strict application. For this reason it aroused little immediate excitement among the Quakers. The first evidence we have that they had discovered the act of 1715 is in the action of the Dartmouth Monthly Meeting of May 20,1717, when a committee was chosen "to Draw up some account to Walter Newbury Concerning a Late act for ye maintenance of ministers and Desire him to take ye said act along with him to Old England and deliver it to John Whiting or some other friend yt he shall think suitable."[100]

It was at this same time that the affairs of Dartmouth Quakers were again before the General Court. Pelig Slocum and John Tucker owned land on the Elizabeth Islands and were accordingly rated to the minister of the town of Chilmark, in the boundaries of which town it was located, although both men resided on the mainland and hence far from Martha's Vineyard.

Not only did the two men petition the General Court but the Yearly Meeting[101] also addressed a representation to the governor who was now His Excellency Samuel Shute. The Council, perhaps realizing from the affair of 1709 what the course of events might be, voted a hearing for the following sessions, all prosecution to cease in the meantime. But the House of Representatives, when finally forced to consider the case, proceeded to vote a dismissal of the whole affair. Even when the minister and town of Chilmark went so far as to ask that the estates of Slocum and Tucker might

be exempted from paying toward Chilmark's ecclesiastical charges and the Council was ready to grant this request, the lower house met the situation with a twice repeated "non concurred."[102]

The result of the events of 1717 was that the Quakers of New England in the following year once more took up their problem of relationship to the established system of the province. Their work so far had shown no lack of energy. Beginning with the systematic recording of sufferings and an endeavor to discover the constitutional basis of the laws of which they complained they were soon pouring applications for redress before the governor of the province and the London Yearly Meeting. Several formal petitions to the Queen in Council had crossed the water, but the English Quakers for one reason or another had failed to push these, though always ready to do what they could for the New England meetings. As a matter of fact whatever the New England Quakers did before 1718 though sincere and strenuous, was accomplished largely through individuals or the smaller meetings, and lacked system. The work done in and after 1718, although it was started by the separate appeal to Boston by Slocum and Tucker, was based on a new theory. All efforts were to center in the Yearly Meeting and by it a common treasury for this special end was organized, to back up a petition to the crown in England.

This policy is recorded in the minutes of the New England Meeting. "The Consideration of the Contineued Sufferings of ffriends Under the Prisbeterian, or Independiant Priest; haveing taken hold of this meeting; it is agreed that ffriens doe as soone as with Conveniency they Can wright to ouer ffriends in great Britain Requesting their Endevours ffor ouer Relief in that Case and In order to Carey on Said business; and to Deffray the Charge

thearof it is agreed that the Quarterly meeting of Rhoad Island doe colect the Some of thirtey pounds; & ye Quarterly meeting of Salem the Some of ffifteen pounds & ye Quarterly meeting of Sandwich & Sittuat the Some of ffifteen pounds; and when colected to be ordered into the hands; of John Wanton & Thomas Richardson; they to remit Ye Same home in ye best method thay can and this meeting will supply with more money ffor that Sarvice if wanted; and Said John Wanton & Thomas Richardson are desired to Take Ye management of that Affair Uder their ceare-"[103]

Not waiting for this committee to act the writers of the epistle to London included in their letter a statement of the case and the request that the London Meeting should immediately take up the same with the government.[104] The official communication from the New England Yearly Meeting to the London Friends, by the hand of Thomas Richardson, was dispatched two months later. In it special emphasis was laid upon the £ 60 which the meeting was then raising to help defray the expenses of an application to the crown.[105]

According to the order of the Yearly Meeting and the promise of Richardson to the London Friends the three Quarterly meetings of New England went systematically to work to raise the sum of £ 60 agreed upon as a necessary beginning. In its meeting of July 11,1718 the Rhode Island Quarterly apportioned its £30 among its five monthly meetings, asking Rhode Island to contribute £ 10, Dartmouth the same, Greenwich three, Providence two and Nantucket five.[106] Dartmouth and Rhode Island, the two meetings which had felt most keenly the weight of the Massachusetts law, each voluntarily contributed an extra 40/.[107] While there was somewhat less enthusiasm outside of the bounds of the Rhode Island Quarterly Meet-

ing, by the beginning of 1719 the sum of £ 60.2'/.6d. had been collected and was dispatched by Richardson to England.[108]
Though the English Friends had so far failed to answer the earlier letter, dated in August, that Richardson, when he consigned the money in January 1719, begged for some word,[109] later events proved that the Londoners were not idle. In fact the answer of the London Yearly Meeting was already on its way to Massachusetts.[110]

The London Meeting for Sufferings of November 28,1718 had considered the Yearly Epistle from New England with its account of sufferings and promise to send money for an application to the government, and appointed a committee to consider the situation.[111] The report which was brought in one month later so far assured the meeting of the injustice of the Massachusetts law that an immediate agreement was reached to appeal to the government.[112]

Through the rest of 1718 and the following year this committee was retained on the New England affairs, and by May 1719 had progressed so far as to have read in the Privy Council a petition which they had drawn.[113] As in the previous petitions to the Governor and Council of Massachusetts the Quakers here set forth "the great hardships they suffer by not paying the Demands of the Priests there" and humbly prayed "in regard the Charter granted to that Colony by King William, Allows a free Exercise and Liberty of Conscience to all subjects that should settle there (except Pap ists) That His Majesty will Commisserate their Case, and Direct the Governor of said Province to Relieve Them herein." This petition was referred to the Board of Trade May 26,1719.[114]

At this point it was suddenly dropped as the result of information given the London Friends by one of the Massachusetts agents.

From him the English Friends heard that the local government was contemplating some sort of legislation for the relief of Quakers,[115] and decided that before going farther they would investigate this rumor. A letter was written to New England asking that the matter be looked into, and the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting responded by sending John Wanton and Thomas Richardson to consult with Thomas Fitch and Jonathan Belcher of the Governor's Council.[116] It was probably at their suggestion that the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting immediately voted to send a delegation to the General Court at its opening, once more to state the case.[117] This order was approved by the Yearly Meeting[118] and an elaborate petition drawn up which was before the Council on July 21, 1720.[119]

The Council went so far at this time as to appoint a committee "to Consider what may with Justice & due Regard to the Laws of this Province be done for their Ease, And more especially to prevent their being oppressed upon any Distress made upon their Estates;" while further discussion was postponed until the following session.[120] In all the House concurred.

While the Council was now ready to be conciliatory the Assembly was still opposed to any great concessions and the following months were disappointing to the New England Meeting. Wanton and Borden were retained as a committee but repeatedly reported lack of success in Boston.[121] The following year (1721) saw the second appointment in the Council of a committee,[122] which went even farther than its predecessor in suggesting a method for relief of Quakers. Constables or collectors were to be "obliged to take as near as may be the Value of the Sum or Sums assess'd," and in case of seizure of stock and a disagreement concerning the value,

after an interval of four days, during which time the charge of keeping was to devolve upon the owner, the assessors of the town were to appraisethe same, the constable to accept this decision and return the overplus "after the necessary Charges of Taking & Keeping the same are deducted." Poor compromise though it was, it savored far too highly of a leniency toward irreligion to find favor in the lower house.[123] The Representatives failed to concur.

At this Dartmouth called a town meeting, voted to assess only that part of the province rate which excluded the £ 100 additional, sent an agent to state the case before the General Court and agreed that any troubles to which the selectmen might be put by virtue of the town's vote regarding the tax should be met by a town rate.[124] When Dartmouth's petition secured the attention of the General Court on December 26 it was favorably received by the Council again who recommended a discharge of the whole matter if Dartmouth would pay the amount assessed upon her in the previous year, but the lower house, unwilling to concur, allowed the case to run over to the following session.[125]

As a result of Dartmouth's town vote her province rate remained partly uncollected, and in May her assessors, John Akin and Philip Taber, were arrested by the sheriff and carried to Bristol. There they met Joseph Anthony and John Sisson of Tiverton who as assessors of that town had had an experience much like that of the Dartmouth men.

The divergent opinion between the Council and House of Representatives which had already manifested itself appeared even more strongly exhibited in the summer of 1723, in a dispute between the two houses, respecting the tax bill for this year.

The Council, in considering the petitions from Dartmouth and Tiverton, paid careful attention to technicalities in the laws of 1692 and 1715. The result was an important decision in the case of each town. The laws, so said the Council, directed how ministers should be chosen; viz. either by the church with sanction of the town or in case they be negligent, then by the General Sessions of the Peace which should provide and settle an orthodox minister. Only after they had done this and found their orders eluded, might they represent the matter to the General Court which should then settle and provide for a minister by assessing a rate additional in the province tax. In applying these laws the Council concluded that it did "not appear That the Sessions of the Peace for the County of Bristol ever appointed and sent a Minister to Tiverton," and until that step should be taken it did not seem to the Council lawful that the General Assembly should appoint a minister as they had attempted to do. In the case of Dartmouth it was discovered that while the town had an orthodox minister he had never made any contract with the town for his maintenance and the General Sessions of the Peace had never made any order on the town for his support, "Nor could they by Law, until the sd Minister had made a Complaint," which he had never done. In view of this decision the Council could not think it right that Dartmouth or Tiverton should be assessed in the coming tax bill any thing more than was their proportionate rate with the other towns.[126]

In spite of this decision victory went to the lower house. Just two days later the Representatives were busying themselves over the ministry in Dartmouth and Tiverton. The sum of £ 100 was voted to Samuel Hunt of Dartmouth from the province treasury, which

sum was to be added to Dartmouth's proportion in the province tax for 1723.[127] Tiverton, still neglectful and refusing to settle an orthodox minister, was to be provided with one by order of the General Court, and his salary of £ 72.11/ was to be paid and raised in similar manner.[128] With both resolves the Council now concurred for one of its technical objections to previous measures had been obviated. The House of Representatives in its order placed the execution of the law in both instances upon the Justices of the County of Bristol, and on the following day passed the tax act of 1723 with its large rates additional on Dartmouth and Tiverton.[129]

In the meantime the Court of General Sessions had been busy enforcing previous legislation. When this law was passed the Dartmouth and Tiverton assessors had already been in Bristol gaol a month for their failure to assess the province rate for 1722. In fact on the very day that the General Court passed the tax bill for 1723 it was called on to consider two petitions, one from Dartmouth and one from Tiverton, asking that these assessors might be released upon payment of the proportionate rates of those two towns. In both cases the Council voted a hearing on the whole case for the fall session, with the immediate release of the prisoners upon promise to return. Once more the House asserted itself as upon previous occasions and refused to concur.[130] This action upon the part of the lower house proved to be the decisive stroke with the Quakers. For a quarter of a century they had been pouring their woes into the ears of Governor, Council and House of Representatives. On numerous occasions the governors had shown kindness and made promises, in the last few years the

Council had given signal evidence of a desire to concede, but no impression had been made on the representatives of the towns of the province who, in this matter which involved a religious question, showed their provincialism even more strongly than in the consideration of other matters which were of greater concern to the royal governors.

The time for an appeal to England was now ripe. We have traced the close relation between the London and the New England Friends during this period and have seen how much Richard Partridge and his associates had already done, especially in the year 1719, and how the matter had been dropped in anticipation of what the local government might be willing to do. When the Friends of New England resolved once more to make application to the crown it was with the determination to send an agent to England, well armed with authority and funds, who should push the matter until some definite result was really accomplished.

The agent chosen by the New England Yearly Meeting to present the case of the Dartmouth and Tiverton assessors in London was Thomas Richardson of Newport who was in the spring of 1723 making preparations for a voyage to England.[131] Richardson was to explain the whole situation to the London Quakers and urge them to renew their earlier efforts, with the understanding that the New England Yearly Meeting would continue to back them financially in anything which they would undertake.[132]

Richard Partridge of London was no sooner apprised of the further application which the New England Friends were making than he began to take necessary measures. There was certainly no man in England better able, in training and in interests to carry the

wishes of the Massachusetts Quakers before the Privy Council and the Board of Trade, than Richard Partridge. Born and educated in New England he was well acquainted with the ecclesiastical system of Massachusetts; an important member of the Society of Friends in London, he had the interests of its people at heart. Of the greatest value was his position as a colonial agent who had for years been dealing with the various branches of the government, especially those which handled colonial affairs. The appreciation which Partridge had of the value and best use of money in bribes and fees, his employment of the right persons and his constant presence on every occasion to see that his case was not allowed to drop:- these were the means by which the Order in Council of June 2,1724 was gained.

During the whole time which Partridge was at work on the New England affair he had the constant support of the London Meeting for Sufferings which voted him an able committee to assist with the work and advanced money.[133] As soon as Thomas Richardson, the New England Quakers' agent, reached England, he was associated with Partridge, but in all matters the latter was leader.

Before Richardson's arrival Partridge had interviewed Chief Justice Weargs for advice in the best way to proceed[134] and had secured John Sharpe as attorney to prosecute the case. It was Sharpe who drew up the petition and on October 21 succeeded in having it put in the paper of business which the Privy Council was to take up on the following day.

Accordingly it was on October 22 that the petition which Richard Partridge and Thomas Richardson presented, in behalf of the four imprisoned assessors of Dartmouth and Tiverton and also the

Quakers in general, was first taken up by the Privy Council and was on that day referred to committee.[135] The details connected with the actions of Partridge and his associates in succeeding months are of value in the light which they throw upon the ways and methods by which the disallowance of colonial legislation was secured. As the case was passed from Privy Council to committee, from committee to the Board of Trade, from the Board of Trade to the Board's attorney, Richard West, and back again, it was followed ceaselessly by Richard Partridge and Thomas Richardson, the auxiliary committee of the London Meeting for Sufferings, and John Sharpe, the Quakers' lawyer.[136] Richard West in drawing up his opinion, summoned Sanderson and Dummer to present the side of the Massachusetts General Court, and Sanderson and Sandford with Bampfield as their attorney appeared on the day of the hearing before the Board of Trade. The journals kept by John Sharpe and Richard Partridge in connection with their accounts of expenditure show just when their presence was most needful to keep their case in the business of the meetings, and at what points it was necessary to pay the largest fees. Before submitting his opinion on the tax act Richard West received £ 4.4/. On the eve of the final hearing before the Lords Committee, when only counsel could argue, Partridge paid £ 10.15/ each to the attorney-and solicitor-general and £ 13.2/.6d.to Talbot. These methods brought the success on which Partridge was determined. The first report rendered, that of Richard West, on the tax act of 1722 in point of law, was not altogether encouraging. In this act West saw nothing unconstitutional, as nothing upon the face of the act indicated that the additional sums levied upon Dartmouth and Tiverton were for the support of the Ministry. The report of the

Board of Trade, though based upon this, was more satisfactory. The tax act of 1723 had been unofficially reported to the Board and the latter was quite ready to take exception to it. "We think it our duty," wrote the Lords of Trade, "to represent to Your Excelcys that by the Charter granted to the Massachusetts Bay, the foundation of this Colony was laid in an absolute & free liberty of conscience for all Christian Inhabitants there, except Papists, But the Presbyterians having absolutely the ascendant in the Assembly of this Province, have assum'd to themselves the authority of an established Church, and would compel the Quakers even in the Towns of Dartmouth and Tiverton, where they are infinitely the majority, to pay a large maintenance to Presbyterian Ministers, whom they call Orthodox, for the service of some few Presbyterian Families only."

When the act of 1723 made its official appearance the Board stood by this statement of opinion and recommended its disallowance. Although the Lords of Trade were repeating West's legal opinion in replying to the order of the committee of the Council, this statement was obviously favorable to Quakers. The Lords Committee went one step farther. On the ground that the additional sums were in fact illegal in spite of the act's containing nothing on its face to prove them so, and that the legal taxes of 1722 were now already collected and could not be affected by a disallowance, they recommended that the act be disallowed. During the whole procedure the Massachusetts General Court had made a poor showing. Its agents had been sent no instructions and, not knowing how to proceed, had thrown their efforts into causing a delay. Not until the day of the hearing before the Board of Trade did the General Court take up the matter, at that time ordering instructions sent

to the Massachusetts agents in London for the defense of the province, but it is doubtful whether they were ever prepared.

The official arrival of the Massachusetts tax act of 1723, during the course of proceedings, sent Partridge back to the Board of Trade to hurry it on to the Privy Council,[137] but the final Order related only to the earlier act.

This Order in Council of June 2,1724 was triumphantly reported to the London Meeting for Sufferings of July 3,[138] and sent off to New England. Though the order therefore reached the Lieutenant-Governor of Massachusetts in a roundabout way, it was given full value.[139] Governor and Council ordered the sheriff of Bristol County[140] to see it carried out, and Joseph Anthony, John Sisson, John Akin and Philip Taber, after an imprisonment of fifteen months, were set free.

This was the literal fulfillment of an order which related only to the tax act and imprisonment of 1722. The bill of 1723, passed in June and definitely stating the reason for the high rate on Dartmouth and Tiverton, had been followed by the imprisonment of delinquent assessors far more speedily than its predecessor. Jacob Taber and Beriah Goddard, assessors of Dartmouth, failed to make the rate on their town.[141] Tiverton had neglected to qualify any assessors whatsoever.[142] In August, when the order came for the release of the prisoners of 1722, the Massachusetts government showed no inclination to be more liberal than necessary. Taber and Goddard had been in Bristol gaol almost nine months,[143] but were obliged to see the others depart without them. Their release which came in November was the result of a petition from Henry Howland, the third of Dartmouth's selectmen, who explained that he

was unable to do his duty in making assessments or performing the other functions of his office because of the absence of his colleagues. The committee of the upper house to which the matter was referred returned a significant report. "That whereas His Majtys Royall Pleasure has been lately signified to this Government for remitting the Additional Tax of the same Nature with this within-mentioned laid by the Gendl Court upon the Towns of Dartmouth & Tiverton in the Year 1722 & for releasing from Imprisonment the persons committed to Gaoll on the same account on which the persons withinnamed were committed, It may be therefore adviseable for this Court to testify their ready & dutiful Compliance with His Majties declared Will and Pleasure in this Matter, by ordering that the Said Jacob Tabor & Beriah Goddard be released from Imprisonment, Upon the said Tabor & Goddard's paying or giving Sufficient Security to the province Treasurer for the payment of the Sum of £ 81.12/, laid on the said Town as their proportion of the province Tax for ye Year 1723."[144]

In Tiverton further trouble was averted by the failure of the General Court and the Bristol justices to keep a minister in the town for any length of time. Theophilus Pickering who was procured in 1722 was paid in two installments the £ 72.11/ promised him,[145] but left "after a Years Trial being Discouraged by the preverse and Untractable Temper & Carriage of the Said people."[146] In 1723 the General Court was unable to find anyone.[147] This failure ended the immediate quarrel of the authorities with the town for it was now ordered that the treasurer of the province receive the sum of £ 27.9/ as Tiverton's tax for the year.[148] This was the last attempt which the General Court made to establish

or assist orthodoxy in Tiverton. Dartmouth had at least two more grants, one of £ 30 in 1724 and another in 1725, but these sums were not added to the province tax.[149]

The Quakers and Baptists had won their case. There was no further attempt by the General Court to add ministerial rates to a town's province tax. The next efforts of the dissenters were directed toward procuring laws which should make it unnecessary to pay ministerial charges even when they were, as normally, a part of the town rate.

Thomas Richardson, returning to New England soon after the important June 2, when the Order in Council was secured, carried with him the large bills of expense which he and Partridge had been obliged to incur in pursuing their object. The total amount was £ 158.15/.5d.[150] Richard Partridge soon afterwards wrote that if further solicitations in England were desired more funds would be needed.[151]

In succeeding months the General Court, although the Order in Council was obeyed, and even the prisoners of 1723 discharged, was not inclined to go farther with the laws which the Quakers demanded. As a result the former troubles continued. The ministerial rate was assessed with the town charges and the constable was under obligation to collect, distrain, or imprison as need be. Especially in the vicinity of Dartmouth, where the recent success of the Quakers had caused much feeling, difficulty was inevitable and the old question between the land owners of the Elizabeth Islands and the town of Chilmark was revived. Pelig Slocum and John Tucker whose case had been carried to the Assembly seven years before, were again under the law. Upon their failure to pay a

rate for building a meeting house in Chilmark, John Mayhew, constable of the town, seized eighty sheep belonging to Slocum and a horse and a heifer which were the property of Tucker. The sheep sold for £ 7. more than the demand, and Tucker's property for £ 5. in excess, so that the usual complaint of exorbitant distraint was entered.[152] A rumor of this incident reaching the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting, it was ordered immediately that an exact account of the matter be prepared as agitation was already beginning for another mighty effort to be released from the "oppression of Presbyterian &c Priests."[153]

This was the situation confronting the Yearly Meeting when in June 1725 it met at Newport. Thanks were first of all voted to the London Friends whose energy had secured the Order in Council of the previous year with the added request that they return the New England Meeting's hearty acknowledgment to the King for this favor.[154] In considering sufferings, "all on Accott of Priests Rates and building their Meeting hous at Chilmark," it was agreed that the London Friends had been so much more successful than the petitioners at Boston that the account of this situation, no more trivial than the troubles of Akin and Taber, should be sent to England.
But in the message which John Wanton and Thomas Richardson were requested to send to Richard Partridge they were to state that if money was needed for further solicitation, as he had warned them it would be, he was to take it on interest until the Yearly Meeting could make him a remittance.

Experience had shown the New Englanders that progress through the various bodies in England dealing with British colonial government was so slow that if immediate relief was to be gained it

must be through the authorities at Boston. Accordingly another committee was asked to travel to Boston as speedily as possible, apply to the General Court, and report their success to John Wanton and Thomas Richardson that it might be included in the letter to Partridge.[155]

Results were not so gratifying as to deter the English Quakers from complying with the request of the Dartmouth Friends. On the second of September, just three months after the Yearly Meeting had sent its message, and four days after the London Meeting for Sufferings had made him head of a committee,[156] Partridge was again before the Privy Council. On this day the register records reference to committee of the "petition of Richard Partridge on behalf of Peleg Slocum, John Tucker and other Quakers, inhabitants of Massachusetts Bay, who are under Severe Sufferings for Conscience Sake, praying the Repeal of such Laws past in that Province as Directly or Consequently affect the Liberties, Properties, Religion or Consciences of His Majestys Protestant Subjects in the said Province, etc."[157]

The fate of this petition was not due to lack of funds[158] or of interest[159] or even Quaker influence, but to the political situation in England. In the London epistle to Rhode Island of September, 1726 the London Quakers wrote, "As to ye Sufferings ffriends are still under in the Massachusets Government on account of Priests maintenance, there has been some steps taken in Order to obtain a more General Ease, in that Case, which at present lyes for a more suitable Opportunity to prosecute it in, and then we hope ye Necessary care will not be neglected."[160]

A year later they were still saying that "the present state of

publick affairs will not allow us to move for anything of this Nature."[161] The end of George I's reign had come very inopportunely for the Quakers. Since 1723 a change had come over the British Board of Trade in the appointment of the Duke of Newcastle as Secretary of State, for his assumption of control in colonial affairs was removing authority from the Board. In spite of the close relation between the Quaker body and both Walpole and Newcastle it was impossible to accomplish anything during the stress of circumstances attending the close of George II's reign, as the Whig leaders were engaged in the vital issue of maintaining control of the government.

The failure of the London Meeting to succeed with the petition of 1725-1727 turned responsibility back upon the New England Yearly Meeting, although it was known that the London Meeting planned to renew its application when a suitable season appeared.[162] Sufferings in Massachusetts continued[163] and resulted in the further work of Joseph Wanton and Richard Borden before the General Court.[164] Funds for their work were voted by the Yearly Meeting[165] and their efforts were suddenly crowned by the passage of the law of June 20, 1728.[166] After a preamble which cites the fact that application had frequently been made to the court in behalf of these people who refused to pay taxes for the support of the ministry, "alledging a scruple of conscience for such their refusal," the law stated that hereafter any belonging to a society of Anabaptists or Quakers should be exempt from having their "polls" taxed for such an object, "nor shall their bod[ie][y]s be at any time taken in execution to satisfy any such ministerial rate or tax assess'd upon their estates or faculty," provided such persons were in the habit of attending

their own meeting on the Lord's day and lived within five miles of a place of worship. Of the Quakers, whose opinions the orthodox were likely to regard with suspicion, a declaration of fidelity and belief in the trinity and divine inspiration of the scriptures was demanded, to be given before the court of General Sessions. To discover who these Anabaptists and Quakers might be, some one of one denomination or the other, appointed by the justices in each county, was to bring annually to the Court of General Sessions a list of persons professing themselves to be Anabaptist or Quaker and in the habit of attending meeting, these lists to be submitted by the clerk of the peace to the assessors of each town or precinct. Upon all not exempt the assessors were ordered to levy the rate, and only they who paid the tax for support of orthodox religion could vote in any matter relating to the ministry of the town. The act was to be in force for five years.[167]

This was the first law made in Massachusetts which in any way exempted the Baptists and the Quakers from the financial oppression of the ecclesiastical legislation. Such as it was it went into effect.[168] How little relief it afforded the dissatisfied Quakers may be seen from their further action. No expression of gratitude came from the next yearly meeting at Newport and no change appears in the general condition of the two sects, the dissenters finding the system too bungling to be practicable, while the five mile limit upset the whole affair for many of them.[169] The general opinion found expression in the words of the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting which met in the following month and agreed that "the Assembly last Seting in Boston have done little or Nothing for the case of Sufferings ffds," and again asked Joseph

Wanton and Richard Borden "to continue their Endevours with the Authority there, for a discharge from these Sufferings they are under and if not Obtain'd to collect those papers & Coppyes which may be propper to be Sent to our ffriends in England which may Enable them the better to seek for Releif there and bring the charge thereof to Our Next Quarterly Meeting."[170] At the end of three months Wanton and Borden had spent £ 11.16/. but had no encouragement to offer and at the end of a half year had "not proceeded any farderwith the Assembly at Boston on behalf of Suffering ffriends."[171] In spite of this they were continued by the Yearly Meeting[172] and through their work did produce further legislation.

This second law, secured like the first one by the efforts of a committee, backed by the Yearly and the Quarterly meetings, was passed December 20,1729. The preamble explained that by the preceding act the polls only of Anabaptists and Quakers were exempted from charge in the support of the ministers of the churches by law established, and the law now ordered that the estates, real and personal, of such Anabaptists and Quakers should be exempt from taxation for the support of ministers. A proviso, occasioned by the troubles at Chilmark, at the same time made it clear that no person was to be freed from the charge toward building any meeting house when the assessment had already been made. This law was enacted for three years and a half.[173]

While this legislation seemed more favorable to the dissenters than that of the preceding year, it came little nearer to solving their difficulties on account of its rigid limitation.[174] Among some of the Quakers there was a distinct aversion to taking advantage of the privilege offered by this or the preceding legisla-

tion, on the ground that exemption was not liberty.[175] Troubles continued which were reported to the Yearly Meeting in the follcwing summer.[176] The result of these reports was a further appointment of John Wanton and Thomas Richardson to send the accounts of sufferings to England with an appeal that the English Friends renew their endeavors, while Joseph Wanton and Richard Borden were ordered to give any possible assistance.[177]

This last vote of the New England Yearly Meeting to apply for help from the London friends was made unnecessary by the appointment of Jonathan Belcher as Governor of Massachusetts. The basis of Belcher's kindness toward Quakers was not, as in Dudley's case, that larger policy of colonial control toward which each question as it appeared was forced to bend. Succeeding governors had been on the whole neutral, leaving matters to their councils, which as the years passed showed growing leniency opposed only by the lower house. With the coming of Belcher the weight of the governor was thrown heavily on the side of the Quakers. The family connection between Belcher and Richard Partridge was the primary cause for Belcher's interest in the Quakers and had been the means of his making many friends among that body in England.[178] Their wealth, organized power and political influence with the Whig leaders he had recognized and, looking into the future, saw the possibility of securing the support of the whole organization by assuming the cause of the local meetings in his province.[179] Just before leaving England he received a delegation of prominent English Friends sent to him by the London Meeting for Sufferings to solicit his support of the New England Quakers.[180]

Jonathan Belcher's opening speech to the Assembly, while

not making special reference to Quakers, recommended that they "imitate the Royal Indulgence of our gracious Soverign, that none of our Laws may carry in them a Spirit of Rigour or Severity towards those who consciently differ from us in the modes of divine worship."[181] Among the New England Friends Belcher's reputation had preceded him and his coming was looked upon with delight.[182] He had not been in the province two months when almost simultaneously two of the quarterly meetings determined to address him in behalf of the Friends, while one of the monthly meetings took steps to show a personal allegiance at the expense of its loyalty to the Assembly. It was Dartmouth which signed a paper to be sent to Belcher "signifying our willingness to Comply with giving him his Salary according to the King's Instructions."[183] In the meantime the Sandwich Quarterly Meeting appointed two of its members to write and sign a paper in behalf of Friends for Belcher's inspection,[184] and the Rhode Islanders, meeting a few days later, once more charged Joseph Wanton and Richard Borden with their earlier duty. "Sinc GovernerBelcher is arrived to the Government of the Massechusets," runs their record, "and that while he was agent in London he Manifested An Inclination to discharge ffriends from Persecution on Account of Priests Rates It is thought propper for ffriends to Apply to him to see what Releif can be had Our ffriends Joseph Wanton & Richard Borden are therefore desired Either to goe or Wright to Sd GovernerBelcher on that Account."[185]

Not until they were reminded of this duty at the next Quarterly Meeting did Wanton and Borden set to work,[186] but in the winter or early spring they obeyed the order, and were ready to

report at the Yearly Meeting in June that they had found some encouragement from the new governor. Still nothing had been done yet and conditions were far from satisfactory.[187] While Sandwich this year reported "Ease with respect to Priests Rates," Rhode Island submitted an account of £ 23:17/from the Rochester Friends for "Priests Rats," and Salem brought in the report from Kittery of £ 10:17/6d.[188] As a result the Yearly Meeting continued the appointment of Joseph Wanton and Richard Borden, desiring them "to make farder Application."[189] It was now generally agreed that since the Massachusetts governor had expressed himself as a friend to Quakers the New England Meeting would no longer need to trouble Friends at home.[190] The London Meeting for Sufferings readily agreed to discontinue the "New England affair."[191]

The direct result of the appeals of the committee appointed and financed by the Yearly Meeting of 1731 was the law of December 24 of the same year. Belcher, writing to Partridge just before the opening of the fall session, said: "The Assembly sits here again this week, and you may depend on every thing in my power for the relief of the Quakers, and I think I shall be able to get a bill past that will be pleasing. The Quakers are very sensible of my readiness & sincerity to serve them."[192] On December 2 he addressed the assembly referring to his earlier speech and spoke of the repeated applications which the Quakers were making. "They are Generally," said he, "a Sett of Vertuous and inoffensive people and good members of the Common Wealth and their Friends in England are a great Body of men, and esteemed as well attached to His Majesty and His Royal House as any of the best of his Subjects; I would therefore upon all these Considerations think it an In-

stance of your prudence and Wisdom to pass Some further Law for their Quiet and ease."[193] A few days later, when writing to Partridge, Belcher inclosed a copy of this speech with the comment, "You'll see by my speech inclosed that I am leading the Assembly to the ease of your Friends, and I have reason to believe by the influence I have on many of the members that a good bill will be past before the Court rises."[194]

The bill was passed December 24,1731. In the preamble it was expressly stated that the Quakers had been complaining of the difficulties in complying with the acts already made for their relief and had been making frequent applications to the court for redress. Its special provision of importance, occasioned by the difficulties met under the special certificate system described in the two preceding laws, was the new method for indicating who might be of the Quaker persuasion. The assessors of any town where Quakers were found or owned land, were annually to make a list of all such persons and give it to the town clerk to be entered in the town records and handed out at six pence a copy to any Quaker desiring to own one. If a Quaker found his name omitted he was to inform the assessors in writing, his statement certified by two of the principal members of his society, appointed by the society for that special purpose. All such were to be exempt from the payment of any taxes whatsoever for the support of the ministry or for building meeting houses.[195] This explicit wording was to correct the troubles which the Quakers had suffered since 1728 and 1729. While exempt from certain rates, if once able to prove himself to be a Quaker living within five miles of a place of meeting, the Massachusetts Friend had found it was not easy to establish his own

identity, for advantage was taken of every technicality. The enforcement of this law for five years would prove whether this new method of exemption was practicable.

In the passage of this bill Belcher's influence had been important[196] and results were gratifying. The lower house had made it no small work for the governor but the satisfaction of the Quakers and their allegiance to Belcher in after years were the reward. This Belcher frankly anticipated, expressing himself to Partridge in a letter as early as January 3, 1731/32[197]. He also confided to his son Jonathan the hope that the New England Yearly Meeting would present an address to the King in his behalf.[198]

In this hope Belcher was disappointed although the New England Friends had much to say in his favor. The Yearly Meeting of 1732, the last which ever recorded "sufferings for priests rates," attributed the new law to Belcher[199] and repeated recognition of his influence in the London epistles of the next three years.[200] The Yearly Meeting of 1732 voted that "An Acknowledgment be Rendered to the General Assembly for what ffavour they have Shown us & in a perticuler Manner to Governer Belcher who we understand has been candid in his Endevours on friends behalf and also to Acquaint Richard Partridge of the Governers ffavour therein."[201] The delegation which presented this acknowledgment met a kind reception and found the governor "Pleased to Signifie his Intentions of ffuture Kindness as it might fall with in his Power."[202]

The news from New England was quickly reported by Richard Partridge to the London Meeting for Sufferings which was instructed by the Yearly Meeting to "write to Such Persons in yt Government as have been Instrumental in Procureing this Great favour

and to make such Gratefull acknowledgments of their kindness in this Respect as they shall think proper."[203] Although Belcher was disappointed that no representation in his favor was sent to the King by either the New England Yearly Meeting or the London Meeting for Sufferings,[204] he made the most of their memorials to himself.

Outside of the Quaker body the result of the law of 1731 was to arouse both the Baptists and Anglicans of the province. The law of 1731, unlike those which preceded it in 1728 and 1729, was limited to the Quaker sect and did not include Baptists. As the law of 1729 expired in 1733 and nothing had succeeded it regarding Baptists, advantage was immediately taken of this fact. A number of Baptists in Bristol County were taxed for ministerial rates and some even imprisoned for non-payment.[205] Upon application to the legislature they were released and a law made for the Baptists similar to that of 1733 for Quakers. This law, passed July 4, 1734, repeated the Quaker legislation of the preceding year with the added proviso that the act should not extend to new towns granted with the customary condition of settling an orthodox minister and erecting a meeting house, until these things had been accomplished.[206] This law was practically reenacted on June 30, 1740 for seven years.[207]

In the meantime the Quaker law of 1731 had started a commotion in the Episcopal camp, as the adherents to the Church of England, though the first sect to gain some exemption, had made no advances since 1727 and were in 1731 under greater disabilities than either the Quakers or Baptists. Immediately after Belcher's speech to the assembly of December 2 and the the appointment by the lower house of a committee to prepare a draught of a bill for the

relief of the Quakers came a memorial from Roger Price of King's Chapel to the governor, council and house of representatives. In it Price called attention to the fact that the members of Church of England suffered the same difficulties and discouragements as the Quakers, not being exempted from taxes for the Congregational minister unless living within five miles of a church and not even then if the church lay outside of the province, and had suffered both distraint and imprisonment.[208] Belcher, upon viewing this memorial, appeared sympathetic and promised his interest, and a joint committee of the two houses was appointed to take it into consideration. In spite of this the case of the Anglicans was allowed to slide and the officials of King's Chapel and Christ Church, seeing the Quaker law was about to pass, decided to raise a sum of money and apply to the crown for its disallowance.[209] The Churchmen were so far successful that the answer from the Privy Council, dated February 2, 1736, stated that only the fact that it was a temporary law, about to expire, prevented the Lords Justices from asking for its repeal. This statement was made on the ground that as the charter of Massachusetts granted a liberty of conscience to all Christians except Papists, consequently such exemption ought not to have been limited to any one sect, but extended to all Protestants. Since the act was so near expiration it did not seem necessary to call for its repeal, but to prevent a renewal or the passage of similar acts it was recommended that an additional instruction be prepared for the governor to forbid him to give his assent to any such law unless the exemption be made general. The Board of Trade was accordingly directed to prepare such an instruction for Belcher.[210]

The result of this order and the instruction to Belcher was not the cessation of Quaker legislation but the alternative mentioned in the report of the Lords Committee. Already, on July 4, 1734 the Baptists had won their cause and a year later, an act had been made exempting the polls and estates of the Episcopalians for five years. It was far from satisfactory but its passage gave Belcher the right to listen to the next appeals which came from his friends, the Quakers. The Yearly Meeting of 1736, foreseeing that the law of 1731 was about to expire, decided to speak for its renewal with the possibility of greater concessions, and appointed a committee to attend the General Court.[211] The result of their work was the law of June 28, 1737 which practically renewed the legislation of 1731 for ten years.[212] Although the Friends had hoped for a greater satisfaction at this time they were forced to admit that the old inconveniences were no longer troublesome.[213]

While making this confession the Yearly Meeting of 1738 failed to vote Governor Belcher the expression of appreciation which he was expecting. This omission came at an awkward moment in his affairs for he was growing more and more certain that his removal was approaching and was gathering together all possible elements which might support him.[214] Of great importance among these were the English Quakers to whom he wrote asking that they would use their influence with Walpole and the Duke of Newcastle to have him retained as governor of Massachusetts.[215] A petition presented in his behalf by Richard Partridge in January, 1739/40 referred to the work he had done for the Quakers of Massachusetts.[216] In recognition of these services which tided the matter over for another year, Belcher sent a memorial of thanks "To my <u>good</u> & <u>worthy</u> <u>Friends</u>, the

people call'd Quakers, in Gt Britain," dated May 9, 1740, which speaks of "the great respect & friendship you have manifested to me upon the many efforts my enemies have been making to have the comissns I have the honour to hold superseded." "I shall take all occaions, " wrote Belcher, "to return the late kind offices you have acted towds me in evry reasona way & manner y I can be desired or expected."[217] In private letters likewise to London Friends Belcher expressed himself strongly in this same strain,[218] placing in the Quakers such confidence as later events failed somewhat to justify.[219] An application in the autumn of 1740 failed to secure what Belcher had hoped[220] and he was superseded in the following year. In spite of their failure Belcher never lost regard for this body of people.[221]

The progress of the Quakers in Massachusetts toward securing exemption from the ecclesiastical laws of the province falls into three distinct periods:- from the beginning to 1718, 1718 to 1730; 1730 to 1740. I. In the first of these periods the various local meetings of New England were busy with the collection of sufferings and numerous petitions to the Governor and Council, constantly reported to the London Yearly Meeting. The English Quakers paid careful attention to these reports, studied Massachusetts legislation and took what measures they could, aside from addressing the government, to secure relief for the New England Friends. II. In 1718 the London Meeting for Sufferings determined to address the Privy Council on Massachusetts affairs and from then until 1730 was almost constantly before the government upon this business. A temporary pause was made in 1719 when the rumor was circulated that the Massachusetts General Court was about

to pass a law favoring Quakers, but in 1723-1724 the test case of the Dartmouth and Tiverton assessors was pushed to a successful conclusion. A further petition (1725-1727) failed to secure attention because of the stress of the political situation in England. III. In 1730 the London Meeting agreed not to pursue the matter farther as a governor favorable to Quakers had reached Massachusetts. From that time on the contest was in Boston and was finally won through Belcher's influence.

While Belcher's work was important in this affair the result would have been impossible without the great change which had come over both houses of the General Court since 1700. The Council had first grown liberal, and in later years the lower house had been forced into line by authoritative messages from England. The disallowance of a law had to receive recognition. It was useless to pass further legislation which might receive the same treatment. The first exemption laws were hardly more than the registration of conditions which the Board of Trade had already forced upon Massachusetts. The opinions of the Lords of Trade, relating to an ecclesiastical question between two dissenting sects, were consistent with their imperialistic policy of suppressing unruly elements in vigorous colonial legislatures. The General Court had been resisting imperial authority, and the case of the Quakers was decided in 1724 at the cost of the Massachusetts Assembly. Such had been the policy of Joseph Dudley as the exponent of the imperial system. The weakness of the Quaker cause in his time was due to the fact that the question had not yet become a vital issue.

While the order in Council of 1724 was not inconsistent with the Board of Trade's general policy, it could not have been obtained without the work of the London Meeting for Sufferings and its representative, Richard Partridge. In the time of William and Mary and during the opening years of Anne's reign the English Quakers had been recognized as an important element in English society, representing large trading interests and great wealth. With the accession of George I they assumed once more a place of importance, with the return of the Whigs to power, and numbered among their ranks men who in later years were very close to Walpole and Newcastle. To this fact much of their success in 1723-1724 was due, and on the power of the Quaker leaders to make him a return Belcher was relying when he worked for the Quaker cause in Massachusetts.

NOTES.

1. Isaac Backus, The History of New England with special reference to the denomination of Christians called Baptists. 3v. 1777-96.

2. Among the Moses Brown Papers, (XVIII, 55), is a paper entitled "Materials toward the History of Friends in New England." It contains a series of excerpts from the records of the New England Yearly Meeting relating to the first settling by the Yearly Meeting of the various quarterly and monthly meetings. Moses Brown also spent some time in 1782 gathering material relating to the proceedings in England in 1723--1724 when the affair of the imprisoned assessors of Dartmouth and Tiverton were before the Board of Trade and Privy Council. Moses Brown Papers, port. entitled "Papers regarding imprisonment of Quakers."

3. Comments on the Massachusetts Quakers of the early eighteenth century are relegated by Palfrey to a footnote in connection with other events of 1724. "From this time," Palfrey concludes, "Quakerism in Massachusetts was unmolested and insignificant." NewEngland, IV, 449 note.

Some good local work has been done in recent years among which should be mentioned William J. Potter, The first congregational society in New Bedford, Mass: its history as illustrative of ecclesiastical evolution, New Bedford, 1889, which prints many documents; also Henry T. Tucker's contributions to the history of the Friends in the vicinity of Dartmouth. Leonard B. Ellis, History of New Bedford and its vicinity, 1602--1892, Syracuse, 1892, discusses in Chapter II the Quakers of the whole region; while Chapter XXVII gives an abstract of Potter and an article by Tucker on the Friends' Society.

The best accounts of events for the Quakers of the whole province have been until recently in Henry. W. Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, Boston, 1882, and Abner C. Goodell, "Notes on Quakers," in Pub. of the Col. Soc. of Mass, I, Transactions, 1895, 140. During the progress of this study a broader treatment has appeared in Rufus M. Jones, The Quakers in the American Colonies, London, 1911.

4. The annual interchange of letters between London and Newport early became a feature of the New England Yearly Meeting. Among the men appointed to the work of transcribing and signing the "epistle to London" were the most prominent members of the society. They were regularly asked to give an account of "truth" among the New England Friends and receive whatever returns came from across the water. The letter when written was read in the whole meeting for approval and ordered sent with an account of "sufferings" enclosed. N. E. Yr. M., passim.

5. Salem Mo. M., 2.

6. Ibid, 2.

7. R.I. Mo. M., I 89; Salem Quart. M., I, 19; N.E. Yr. M., 98, 111, 123.

8. The first item of this nature entered in the records of the Yearly Meeting is as follows:--"At a generall yearly mans meeting at Rhod island At ye house of William Codington the 14 day of ye 4 month 1686---It is---agreed yt ffriends in their seaverall Respective monthly meeting Boock Record their sufferings & bring them in to this meeting yearly to be Recorded here and sent for Ingland." N.E. Yr. M., 3.

9. N.E. Yr. M., 5--6

10. See for example the report of the Yearly Meeting for 1701. N.E. Yr. M., 15.

11. N.E. Yr. M., 19; R.I. Mo. M., I, 184; R.I. Quart. Meeting, 46, 47.

12. N.E. Yr. M., 31--32.

13. Ibid, 33.

14. R.I. Quart. M., 38, 39. Another case appears in Dartmouth Mo. M., 47, 48.

15. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XII, 192--193.

16. Ibid, XII, 224, 230, 241, 247.

17. Book of Cases, II, 22--23.

18. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XII, 235--236.

19. N.E. Yr. M., 12.

20. Epistles Rec'd, I, 301--303; Epistle from the N.E. Yr. M., 1699; Lond. Yr. M., II, 302.

21. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XIV, 224--225, 272.

22. Ibid, XIV, 229--230.

23. Ibid, XIV, 277.

24. Ibid, XIV, 277--278.

25. Epistles Sent, I, 367--368, Epistle to N.E., 1700.

26. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XIV, 281--282.

27. Ibid, XIV, passim; XV, 87, 93, 106.

28. Ibid, XIV, 350, 353, 360; XV, 38.

29. N.E. Yr. M., 15; Epistles Rec'd, I, 345, Epistle to London, 1701.

30. This petition appears in full in Epistles Rec'd, I, 346.

31. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XV, 184.

32. C.O. 5, 910, 381--382.

33. Presented the case of the wool weavers before the House of Lords in 1720. Biog. Cat., 294; Dict. Nat. Biog.

34. In 1718 Hyam signed a petition to the Board of Trade

from the Merchants Trading to New England, Virginia and Carolina, asking them not to discontinue the bounty granted by Parliament on pitch, tar and turpentine imported from the plantations. C.O.5, 867.

35. Jones, Quakers in the Am. Cols., 205--207 and note.

36. Kelsall Diaries, 1704, I, 25, 30. Here for example are the names of William Penn, Thomas Ellwood, John Field, Theodor Eccleston, Richard Claridge, Thomas Wilkinson, George Whitehead, John Fothergill, John Whiting, Daniel Philips, Joseph Grove, Joseph Wyeth, Daniel Quare, Edward Hastwell, Robert Haydock, James Dickenson and Benjamin Bealing.

37. Dickerson, Am. Col. Gov., 20--57.

38. John Gurney was offered a seat in Parliament by Sir Robert Walpole but declined the offer as incompatible with his religious views. Biog. Cat., 294--296. J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 20 May 1740, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 507; J. Belcher to [T]Hyam, 25 Oct. 1740, Ibid, VII, 522 et alia.

39. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XV, passim; Cal. St. Papers, 1701, #286.

40. Epistles Sent, I, 408--410, Epistle to R.I., 1701.

41. Kimball, Joseph Dudley.

42. Lond. Yr. M., III, 77.

43. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVI, 294--295.

44. Ibid, XVI, 299--300.

45. Ibid, XVI, 305, 311. "To the ministers and Elders of the { Presbiterian / Independt } Congregations.
There being severall severe Laws made by your Brethren in New Engld both in the Massachusetts Bay Province and also in the Colony of Connecticutt agst our ffriends the People called Quakers only

for their Conscientious Dissent from ye Nationall Way there, and not for any Crime or Evillfact done by them.

Now if you are for liberty of Conscience to those that Dissent from you and are willing our friends in New England should Enjoye the like liberty of their Consciences there, as you with us doe here,-- We request you to manifest your sincerety herein, not only by shewing your dislike thereof to your Brethren there, but also by your Concurrent application (with us) to ye Queen, that she would be favourably pleased to disallow all such Laws and in the meantime we hope you will find it Expedient to give your publick declaration agst. the said Laws.

We desire your speedy answer and Remain your Christian ffriends

Wm. Crouch
Wm. Mackett
Theodr. Eccleston
Jno. Whiting
John ffield
George Whitehead"

Lond. the 22m 9o 1703

Book of Cases, II, 140--141. There is another copy in the Public Record Office, C.O.5, 864.

46. "To Mr. Wm. Crouch Mr. Jno. ffield Mr. George Whitehead Mr. John Whiting and Mr. Wm. Mackett.

Gentlemen

Your Papers having been Communicated to us severally we have in complyance with your desire wrote two distinct Letters to our Brethren in New England and therein laid before them the matter of your complaint.

You will easily allow that we must expect their answer before

we can take any farther steps: only as we have in those letters fully signifyed to them, soe we doe in this Joyntly declare to you, that we are most unfeignedly for such a liberty of Conscience every where, as you with us doe here by Law enjoy.

Wee are

Your servts. in the Lord

J Spademan	Thos: Rowe
Josh: Oldfield	Ben: Rowe
Ben: Robinson	Matth: Clarke
Ro: Fleming	Robt. Bragge"

January 17th 1703/4

Book of Cases, II, 141.

47. A letter was also written by the Presbyterians(Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVI, 325, 328) and is probably the one printed in Calamy, Baxter, I, 670--672. It is here described as "Sign'd by several of the other Three Denominations of Dissenters and sent in their common Name to some Ministers of Reputation in New England, to be communicated to their Brethren." It may never have reached its destination.

48. C.O.5, 864.

49. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVII, 257.

50. Lond. Yr. M., III, 125.

51. In Book of Cases, II, 144--154, appear the following papers:--Memorial of Sir Henry Ashurst to the Board of Trade, Answer to Ashurst by the Quakers, Ashurst's second petition, Answer by the Quakers, Instances of persecution under Connecticut law, Letter from the Quakers to the governor of Connecticut.

52. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVII, 108, 112, 156,...212, 226, 234, 241, 274, 276, 291, 299, 303, 309.

53. Ibid, XVII, 316--317, 320; XVIII, 26.

54. John Field and Joseph Wyeth to the Governor of Connecticut, Book of Cases, II, 152--154. The act had been repealed by Connecticut before this letter arrived. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVIII, 178.

55. Dudley to the Board of Trade, 2 Oct. 1706, C.O.5, 912, 274--276; Trumbull, Hist. of Conn., I, 420.

56. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVII, 268.

57. Cal. State Papers, Am. and the West Indies, 1702, #966.

58. Book of Cases, II, 154--157. At the same time the London Meeting for Sufferings agreed to send to the Rhode Island Meeting the complaints which Dudley had made in his letter to the Board of Trade in order that the Rhode Island Quakers might prepare to defend themselves if occasion arose. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVII, 276, 282.

59. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVIII, 11.

60. Board of Trade to Dudley, 4 Feb. 1705/06, C.O.5, 912, 119--120.

61. Book of Cases, II, 167--168; Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVIII, 139.

62. There are several proofs of this statement. In 1703 a petition from Sandwich Quakers reached Dudley, and he seems to have taken some interest, perhaps attempting to find out the number of the sect in the province. Sandwich Mo. M., 51; N.E. Hist. & Gen. Reg., II, 149.

63. C.O.5, 912, 274--276. In addition to making his statement to the Board of Trade Dudley in his interview with him so frightened Campbell that the latter sent off in all haste to the Board a letter of apology. C.O.5, 864.

64. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVII, 257, 309, 321.

65. This money was collected from Rhode Island, Salem, Lynn, Sandwich, Dartmouth, Scituate and Boston. Epistles Rec'd, II, 27--30, Epistle from Lynn Mo. M., 12 Jan. 1707/08; Lond. M. for Sufferings, XIX, 65--66; Dartmouth Mo. M., 27; Salem Mo. M., 25; R.I. Mo. M., I, 199, 200, 203; N.E. Yr. M., 35--36.

66. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XVIII, 179, 184, 230, 245.

67. R.I. Mo. M., I, 82, 184.

68. R.I. Quart. M., 47.

69. Salem Quart. M., I, 5.

70. N.E. Yr. M., 36.

71. Mass. Archives, XI, 237.

72. This petition appears in full in Mass. Archives, XI, 235.

73. Epistles Rec'd, II, 27--30, Epistle from Lynn Mo. M., 1707/08; Lond M. for Sufferings, XIX, 66.

74. Dartmouth Mo. M., 43.

75. Ibid, 45.

76. R.I. Mo. M., II, 15.

77. Ibid, II, 16.

78. R.I. Quart. M., 53.

79. This petition appears in full in R.I.Quart. M., 54.

80. Dudley to the B. of T., 1 Mar. 1708/09, C.O.5, 913, 113--114.

81. R.I. Quart. M., 55.

82. Mass. Archives, XI, 279--280. The paper is entitled, "A Memorial of the Governour Council & Assembly of Her Majties Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England for their Vindication against the Suggestions and Insinuations of any who may accuse them

of harshness and Severitys towards such as are of different perswasions from them in matters of Religion." A copy is filed among the Board of Trade Papers for the years 1718--1720. C.O.5, 869,No9.

83. From a letter written by Dummer to Sewall (7 Dec. 1709) it would appear that it did little more than intensify the irritation which the Board of Trade felt toward Massachusetts. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XX, 11. The answer written by the Board of Trade to Dudley's letter of March 1, 1708/09, and sent to him Jan. 16, 1709/10, ignores the whole discussion.

84. During the whole time of imprisonment of these men the Monthly Meetings of Rhode Island regularly arranged for their comfort and for the support of their families. Thomas Taber was a Baptist rather than a Quaker, but was included in this benevolence. R.I. Mo. M., II, 21; Dartmouth Mo. M., 46--47, 49.

85. R.I. Mo. M., II, 19.

86. Ibid, II, 20.

87. Lond. Yr. M., IV, 58; Lond. M. for Sufferings, XIX, 296, 301, 307, 310.

88. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XIX, 324.

89. "Joseph Grove Reports his and some other friends being with the Independt Preachers according to appointment and were Civilly Treated by them--and they seem to shew their great dislike to their Brethren in New Englands proceedings agst our friends there--and offered their Assistance in writing over to them, to stop the prosecution agst our friends and one of their ministers that intends sudenly to goe over declar'd he would be assisting therein." Lond. M. for Sufferings, XIX, 331.

90. Dummer to Sewall, 7 Dec. 1709, Lond. M. for Sufferings, XX, 11.

91. Dartmouth Mo. M., 47.

92. Mass. Prov. Laws, IX, 47, ch. 124.

93. Dartmouth Mo. M., 47--48, 49; Lond. Yr. M., IV, 58.

94. N.E. Yr. M., 52. Further Quaker approval of Dudley may be found in, Epistles Rec'd, II, 29--30, Epistle from the Lynn Mo. M., 1707/08; Ibid, II, 63--64, Epistle from the N.E. Yr. M., 1708; Lond. Yr. M., IV, 58. A different view is taken by Palfrey, New England, IV, 449 note.

95. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXII, 125.

96. House Journal, 1715, 8.

97. N.E. Yr. M., 90; Epistles Rec'd, II, 186, Epistle from N.E. Yr. M., 1715.

98. Lond. Yr. M., V, 155--156; Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXII, 125, 127. "Our friends of New England had but too much Reason for giving us a hint of their design Because ye Ministers and Elders of Boston had concerted Such a Project among themselves and That Cotton Mather & Ebenezer Pemberton, Two of their Preachers had agreed to undertake the voyage as agents; But when they came afterwards to lay their Intentions before the Assembly, such Reasons were there offered against it, yt it was Quasht, at least for the present." Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXII, 230; Epistles Sent, II, 238; Lond. Yr. M., V, 220.

99. House Journal, 1715, 17, 18.

100. Dartmouth Mo. M., 115.

101. N.E. Yr. M., 98, 99; Epistles Rec'd, II, 211, Epistle from N.E. Yr. M., 1717.

102. House Journal, 1717, 21, 24, 25, 27.

103. N.E. Yr. M., 102.

104. Ibid, 101, 103; Epistles Rec'd, II, 239, Epistle from N.E. Yr. M., 1718; Lond. Yr. M., V, 363.

105.. Letter Book of Thomas Richardson, II, 158--159.

106. R.I. Quart. M., 96.

107. Ibid, 99, 100.

108. N.E. Yearly Meeting, 104.

109. Letter Book of Thomas Richardson, II, 181--182.

110. Epistles Sent, II, 285, Epistle to N.E. Yr. M., 1718.

111. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXII, 341--342.

112. Ibid, XXII, 342, 356; Epistles Sent, II, 285.

113. Epistles Sent, II, 295, Epistle to N.E. Yr. M., 1719.

114. Acts of the Privy Council, II, 761.

115. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 270.

116. R.I. Quart. M., 104. It is difficult to discover how much Belcher did for the Quakers at this time.

117. Ibid, 105.

118. N.E. Yr.M., 108; Epistles Rec'd, II, 291, Epistle from N. E. Yr. M., 1720.

119. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 270.

120. Ibid, II, 270; Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXIII, 78--79.

121. R.I. Quart. M., 114, 115; Epistles Rec'd, II, 312--313, Epistle from N.E. Yr. M., 1721.

122. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 270.

123. Ibid, II, 270.

124. Potter, First Cong. Soc. of New Bedford, 26; Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 271.

125. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 271.

126. Ibid, II, 271.

127. Ibid, II, 272; X, 316, ch. 77.

128. Ibid, II, 272; X, 317, ch. 78.

129. Ibid, II, 293, ch. 8.

130. Ibid, II, 272.

131. R.I. Mo. M., II, 211, 212.

132. N.E. Yr. M., 119.

133. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXIII, 346, 347, 349.

134. Moses Brown Papers, "Papers regarding imprisonment of Quakers."

135. Acts of the P.C., III, 58. This famous petition in contemporary manuscript form may be found in the Mass. Archives, Board of Trade Papers, Moses Brown Papers and Book of Cases. It has been printed in Backus, Baptists, Gough, Quakers, Hallowell, Pioneer Quakers, etc.

136. The important documents belonging to this case are printed in Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 273, 277; additional documents of interest are among the Moses Brown Papers, entitled "Papers regarding imprisonment of Quakers." See also Acts of the Privy Council, III, 58, 59.

137. Acts of the Privy Council, III, 59; Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 277; Backus, Baptists, I, 504; 6 Mass. Hist.Colls., II, 170--171, Sewall's Letter Book.

138. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXIII, 402.

139. The Quakers were in too great haste to wait for a delivery by the government which might mean further delay. It is probable that the order was brought to Rhode Island by Thomas Richardson. It was placed in the hands of "one of the assistants" of Rhode Island who gave it to Charles Church, Sheriff of Bristol County.

Church in turn submitted it to the Lieutenant-Governor and received his orders. Lond. Yr. M., VI, 301; 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., II, 171, Sewall's Letter Book; Moses Brown Papers, "Papers regarding imprisonment of Quakers"; Epistles Sent, II, 378--379.

140. The expenses incurred by Charles Church, sheriff of Bristol County, in committing the assessors of Dartmouth and Tiverton to gaol in the two years 1722 and 1723 amounted to 8 pounds, 7 shillings. In June 1724 the General Court ordered the General Sessions of the Peace to take this account into consideration and in November 1725 allowed the sum from the province treasury. Mass. Prov. Laws., X, 457, ch. 68, 650, ch. 198.

141. The warrant for the arrest of Taber and Coddard is preserved among the Moses Brown Papers.

142. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 441, ch. 26, 457, ch. 68.

143. The financial assistance which the Dartmouth Monthly Meeting voted to John Akin and Philip Taber was repeated for Jacob Taber and Beriah Coddard. Dartmouth Mo. M., 183.

144. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 498, ch. 191; Lond. Yr. M., VI, 299; Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXIII, 437--438.

145. Mass. Prov. Laws, X, 387, ch. 308.

146. Ibid, X, 458, ch. 69.

147. Ibid, X, 317, ch. 78, 387, ch. 308.

148. Ibid, X, 458, ch. 69.

149. Ibid, X, 541, ch. 311, 598, ch. 62.

150. The largest item, John Sharpe's account, was 57 pounds, 3 shillings, 3 pence toward which Partridge had paid 15 pounds, 15 shillings in April, leaving a balance of 41 pounds, 8 shillings, 3 pence. To the Clerk of the Council had been owing 30 pounds, 8 shillings, 6 pence. The rest was due Partridge. The New England

Yearly Meeting had already paid 91 pounds, 18 shillings, 11pence, and the London Friends 20 pounds, 17 shillings, 9 pence, leaving only the small remainder of 4 pounds, 10 shillings, 6 pence, Moses Brown Papers.

151. R.I. Quart. M., 139.

152. Dart. Mo. M., 182--183.

153. R.I.Quart. M., 138.

154. Epistles Rec'd, II, 378, Epistle from N.E. Yr. M., 1725.

155.N.EYearly Meeting, 122.

156. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXIV, 22--23.

157. Acts of the Privy Council, III, 121.

158. The money, which the New England Yearly Meeting of 1725 told Richard Partridge to take on interest until it could be raised in New England, he advanced himself, and by June 1725 the New England collectors had sent him 120 pounds. As more was still needed the New England Yearly Meeting of 1726 voted 150 pounds additional which was apportioned, 100 pounds to Rhode Island Quarterly, 20 pounds to Sandwich and Scituate, and 30 pounds to Salem. N.E. Yr. M., 125, 127; Dartmouth Mo. M., 185, 189; Epistles Rec'd, II, 386, Epistle from N.E. Yr. M., 1726.

The money was assessed by the several quarterly meetings on their monthly meetings and by the latter upon the weekly meetings. R.I. Quart. M., 144.

A little later someone conceived the idea of making a generous gift in money to Partridge to express the appreciation of the New England Yearly Meeting. The idea was adopted at the Yearly Meeting of 1728 which also apportioned the sum on the quarterly meetings, the latter continuing the method as before. N.E. Yr. M., 132.

The amount (60 pounds) was assessed as follows:--

R.I. Quart., 40 pounds.
- R.I. Mo.-- 24 pounds.
- Dartmouth-- 10 "
- Nantucket-- 6 "
- Providence-- } omitted because not affected by
- Greenwich-- } Mass. law.

Sandwich & Scituate Quart., 8 pounds.
- Sandwich Mo.--5 pounds, 5 shillings.
- Scituate-- 2 " , 15 "

Salem Quart., 12 pounds.
- Salem Mo.-- 5 pounds.
- Hampton & Amesbury--3 " , 10 shillings.
- Dover-- 3 " , 10 "

It was all reported paid by June 1729.

N.E. Yr. M., 135, 136; Mo. M. Bk. of Scituate, Marshfield and Duxbury, 59; R.I. Quart. M., 154--155; Sandwich Mo. M., 127; Salem Quart. M., II, 7; Salem Mo. M., 88b.

159. The London Meeting for Sufferings listened to the report of progress which Partridge submitted on Sept.3, 1725, the day following his visit to the Council and brought the matter up at each meeting through the five following weeks. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXIV, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31; Epistles Sent, II, 392. See also N.E. Yr. M., 130, Epistle to London, 1727.

160. Epistles Sent, II,399--400, Epistle to N.E.Yr. M., 1726.

161. Ibid, II, 416, Epistle to N.E. Yr. M., 1727.

162. N.E. Yr. M., 133--134, Epistle to London, 1728.

163. Salem Quart.M., II, 3; R. I. Quart. M., 153.

164. R.I. Quart. M., 153.

165. N.E. Yr. M., 131--132.

166. The Baptists and Quakers seem to have ignored entirely the law passed December 19, 1727 in favor of the Church of England, by which the ministerial taxes taken from Churchmen were to be paid over to their own clergymen. Such an arrangement would have been distasteful to the opposers of a "hireling ministry."

167. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 494, ch. 4.

168. Several orders of Bristol Sessions relating to the making of lists under this law appear in the records. Bristol Sessions, III B, 109, 126.

169. Such as it was it deterred the London Quakers from further application to the government. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXIV, 231.

170. R.I. Quart. M., 154; Sandwich Mo. M., 127; Diary of John Comer, 62; R.I.Quart. M., 160; Salem Quart. M., II, 7; N.E. Yr. M., 136.

171. R.I.Quart. M., 156, 157.

172. N.E. Yr. M., 136, 137.

173. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 543, ch. 6.

174. This legislation was described by the Quakers as "something tending to our ease but not fully in Such Manner as ffriends can Accept." N. E. Yr. M., 142.

175. Bristol Sessions, III B, 146, 147.

176. N.E. Yr. M., 139, 140.

177. Ibid, 140.

178. J. Belcher to J. Belcher, Jr., 12 Aug. 1732, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VI, 164; Same to same, 12 Nov. 1740, Ibid, VII, 523--524. His papers contain many letters to English Quakers, a-

mong them Partridge, Gurney and Hyam.

179. J. Belcher to Rip Van Dam, 11 Oct. 1731, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VI, 451; J. Belcher to F. Harrison, 15 Nov. 1731, Ibid, VI, 455; J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 30 Oct. 1739, Ibid, VII, 236.

180. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXIV, 352, 356.

181. Pubs. of the Col. Soc. of Mass. Vol. I. Transactions. "Note on Quakers" by A. C. Goodell, 143; Palfrey, IV, 534.

182. Diary of Z. Collins, 17.

183. Dartmouth Mo. M., 222.

184. Sandwich Quart. M., 22.

185. R.I. Quart. M., 171.

186. R.I. Quart. M., 171. 8d. 11m. 1730.

187. For conditions in Bristol County at this time see Bristol Sessions, III B, 160.

188. NE. Yearly Meeting, 142.

189. N.E. Yr. M., 143. A sum of thirty pounds was voted for the necessary expenses. Salem Mo. M., 93.

190. N.E. Yr. M., 144, Epistle to London, 1731; Lond. Yr. M., VII, 331.

191. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXV, 40.

192. J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 1 Nov. 1731, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VI, 37.

193. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 635.

194. J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 7 Dec. 1731, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VI, 82.

195. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 619, ch. 11.

196. J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 3 Jan. 1731/32, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VI, 94.

197. J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 27 Apr. 1732, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VI, 123.

198. J. Belcher to J. Belcher Jr., 28 Apr. 1732, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VI, 125.

199. Epistles Rec'd, II, 477, Epistle from N.E. Yr. M., 1732; Lond M. for Sufferings, XXV, 246--247.

200. Epistles Rec'd, II, 488--489, 497, 506.

201. N.E. Yr. M., 145--146.

202. Ibid, 148.

203. Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXV, 155. The success of Massachusetts made a profound impression upon the English Quakers on account of the resistance which they were making to payment of tithes. Papers relating to the Quakers Tythe Bill, 5.

204. J. Belcher to [T.]Richardson, 14 Aug. 1732, 6 Mass. Hist.Colls., VI, 481; J. Belcher to J. Belcher, Jr., 18 Sept. 1732, Ibid, VI, 182; J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 21 May 1734, Ibid,VI,462.

205. Backus,Baptists, II,30.

206. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 714, ch. 6.

207. Ibid, II, 1021, ch. 6.

208. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 272--273.

209. Updike, Narragansett Church, II, 504--505.

210. Pubs. of the Col. Soc. of Mass, Vol. I. Transactions. Note on Quakers by A. C. Goodell, 143; Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 635; Acts of the Privy Council, III, 491--492. Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, 442 ff.

211 N.E.Yearly Meeting, 159; 163, 165; Epistles Rec'd,II, 543.

212. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 876, ch. 6.

213. N.E.Yearly Meeting, 168, Epistle to London, 1738.

214. There was apparently at this time a certain coolness toward Belcher among the New England Quakers which was reflected in the London Meeting for Sufferings. Diary of Z. Collins, Nov. 10, 1737; B.I. Quart. M., 198; Lond. M. for Sufferings, XXVI, 324, 354; XXVII, 34--35.

215. J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 15 Jan. 1739/40, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 262.

216. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 636.

217. 6 Mass. Hist.Colls., VII, 505.

218. J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 1 May 1740, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 284; Same to same, 7 May 1740, Ibid, VII, 284; J. Belcher to Bubb Dodington, 8 May 1740, Ibid, VII, 295--297; J. Belcher to [T.] Hyam and J. Gurney, 9 May 1740, Ibid, VII, 505. To his son Belcher wrote (19 May 1740) "I can't enough express my gratitude for his [Richard Partridge] great & unwearied care, vigilance & fidelity to my interest & service. Such a friend is worth the name of one & my heart is fir'd with gratitude to the whole body of Quakers who have at this juncture given such signal proof of their sincerity to serve me at a time when I so much wanted their interest & friendship." Ibid, VII, 301.

219. "I really beleive an earnest letter sign'd by Mr. Gurney, Hyam & some other of your principal Friends & directed to Sr. Rob could still secure me in both provinces." J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 20 May 1740, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 507; J. Belcher to [T.] Hyam, 25 Oct. 1740, Ibid, VII, 522.

220. J. Belcher to R. Partridge 26 Jan. 1740/41, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 363; J. Belcher to J. Belcher, Jr., 27 Jan. 1740/1741, Ibid, VII, 366--367.

221. J. Belcher to R. Partridge, 7 May 1741, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VII, 382; Same to same, 31 Aug. 1741, Ibid, VII, 546; J. Belcher to J. Belcher, Jr., 17 June 1741 Ibid, VII, 542. Belcher's later appointment as governor of New Jersey has been attributed to the work of English Quakers. Palfrey, New England, IV, 562 note.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

In the year 1691 there was but one Episcopal church in the whole province of Massachusetts Bay. By 1725 the number had increased to five, which included King's Chapel and Christ Church of Boston and the rural parishes of Bristol, Newbury and Marblehead. This growth was representative of the work which the Church of England was in this interval doing in the whole line of colonies from Maine to South Carolina and the West Indies.

The advance made by the English Church in the years following the accession of William and Mary was not due to a consistent policy on the part of the English government. In spite of the close personal relation between William III. and Henry Compton, Bishop of London, William's reign, though friendly to the low churchman, was concerned especially in ecclesiastical affairs with the interests of the dissenters and was more or less indifferent to the ambitions of the English Church. In the reign of Anne the sympathy of the monarch was thrown in distinctly with the interests of the Church which was able to take unusual strides in the direction of exclusive rights during the Tory ascendency just preceding her death, but lost this preeminence in the succession of the House of Hanover. Unperfected plans were abandoned under the Whigs whom the accession of George I placed in power, and the authority which soon came to be exercised by Walpole did not in any way improve the situation, as he openly expressed a lack of sympathy.[1]

It was therefore in a period of comparative indifference so far as the government was concerned that the great Colonial work

of the English Church was begun, and at the end of forty years was still vainly looking for governmental support. In spite of this deficiency very definite advances were made by the Church of England in the colonies through the work of individuals and organizations.

Two particular forces came together to effect these results. On the one hand the Bishop of London, Henry Compton, early took a lively interest in the transatlantic portion of his diocese and through his whole life time did what lay in his power to advance the interests of the Church over the seas.[2] The influence which he did possess in William's reign was the result of his low church and Whig learnings which had earlier cost him his authority under James II. He had acted upon the committee of the Privy Council dealing with trade and foreign plantations,[3] and later, at its organization, became an ex officio member of the Board of Trade. In questions which concerned ecclesiastical affairs in the colonies it was customary for the Board to secure the recommendations of the Bishop of London,[4] although his advice was not always followed.[5]

The second force behind the growth of the colonial church in the provincial period was an organization whose origin was due to the interest in the formation of religious societies conspicuous in England at the close of the seventeenth century.
The connecting link between the Bishop of London and the religious societies appears in the person of Thomas Bray, bishop's commissary in Maryland, who was instrumental in the founding of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and in the organization of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Indications of the later work of the S.P.G. appear in the original constitution of

the S.P.C.K. At home this society was to promote religious and secular education through the establishment of libraries and schools; abroad it was to assist the bishop's missionaries in those colonies where no financial provision was made for them, pension ministers' families and establish libraries.[6] The S.P.G., in absorbing the functions abroad of the S.P.C.K., obtained a charter which did little more than repeat these duties with modifications. There had appeared however, particularly in the work of George Keith for the S.P.C.K., a secondary object toward which the earlier society moved and in which it was followed by its successor. In the Quaker of the last decade of the seventeenth century the English Churchman saw not one of an irritating but harmless dissenting sect, but the member of a great organization, non-Christian in its teaching, eccentric in its customs.[7] The strongest opposition to its supremacy which the Church of England met in the early eighteenth century came from the Quaker meetings of England and America. In the attack upon them the Quakers saw not only religious intolerance but political injustice as well, for the Anglican was the church of the state, and the Quakers, even more conspicuously than the other English dissenters, were hemmed in by political disabilities. In the colonies the struggle resolved itself into a duel in which the two sides were not unevenly matched. Backed by the two parent bodies at home, the London Yearly Meeting and the English Church, the latter working through the Bishop of London and the S.P.G., the battle was fought out. In Pennsylvania, where Quakerism had its stronghold, the Anglican was less successful, in Maryland where Bray's chief work was done, opposition set up by the Quakers to the establishment of the English Church, was in time defeated and the act of religion

passed and allowed.

As the situation was in each colony modified by conditions resulting from the nature of that colony's early settlement, in New England three varying types of the struggle appeared. In Connecticut the Quaker-Anglican conflict was practically non-existent for unorthodox religious ideas found little encouragement within its borders. The Church of England, when finally introduced came among people who were already Anglicans and later proselytized from the Congregational churches of the colony. In Rhode Island the Church found itself facing a number of different religious groups, united in their opposition to an ecclesiastical system when joined to the state, but differing much among themselves. Of these the Quakers were the largest and most influential body and the only one having a strong support in England. Among these people there was a large number who claimed no particular religious affiliation. In Massachusetts existed a condition midway between these two. As in Connecticut the Congregational church stood firmly supported by legislation which protected it as the favored system. In addition to it however, there were in the province, as the previous chapters have shown, so many communities of Quakers or of people with other unorthodox religious ideas, that they had, from the beginning of the provincial government, formed a serious problem in the enforcement of Massachusetts ecclesiastical law. For a decade the most important work done by the S.P.G. in Massachusetts was among these people.

The situation in New England was understood by Thomas Bray who distinguished carefully between Rhode Island and the two larger

colonies. To the former he would have missionaries immediately sent to deal with atheism; with the dissent of Massachusetts and Connecticut he had no wish to interfere.[8] In two of its other purposes the S.P.G. in its early years gave evidence not only of an unwillingness to clash with New England Nonconformity but even of an eagerness to act in conjunction with it. When in 1704 the secretary was communicating with the Board of Trade in regard to work among the Indians he was informed of the existence of the old Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England and urged to discover how its funds were employed. A later letter from Sir William Ashurst to the secretary described most cordially the work of this organization.[9] At about the same time an account came to the S.P.G. of an organization in New England known as the Society for the Propagation of Religion, founded on the pattern of the corresponding societies existing in London.[10] The S.P.G. exchanged publications with this society.

The principle laid down by Bray was carried out in the work of George Keith and John Talbot, its first missionaries. George Keith especially, having himself passed from Quakerism to Keithian Quakerism and thence to the Church of England, made his great work to lead his former friends from their "errors." With this in view Keith and Talbot went early to Rhode Island, the center of New England Quakerism.[11] There they found one Anglican church already in existence as Newport had been favored by Bray three years before the founding of the Venerable Society. Its first two ministers, both sent out by Compton,[12] were followed in 1704 by the Rev. James Honeyman who had crossed originally to be in the Narragansett Country.[13] There was much urging in the early

days of the Society that a missionary be sent to the west shore of Narragansett Bay[14] but it was not supplied until 1717.[15] In 1723 the little church in Providence received a minister.[16]

In Massachusetts Keith and Talbot visited chiefly the towns which most closely resembled Rhode Island, on Cape Ann and in the boundaries of the old Plymouth Colony. It was not however in the strongly Quaker community of Dartmouth or in the part-Quaker, part-Congregational towns of Salem and Lynn, Sandwich and Falmouth that they met their warmest welcome. Instead of this it was in that group of Rhode Island border settlements which had given the Bristol justices their greatest problem in administration, through an indifference to religious teaching and a strong determination to have political and personal liberty, that these men were most kindly received. Around a nucleus of sincere Churchmen gathered a group of independent or negative thinkers, more than ready to meet Massachusetts ecclesiasticism with any stronger weapon.[17] Such was the condition in Freetown, Tiverton and Little Compton and less conspicuously in Swansea.[18] Swansea and Little Compton decided for Church of England ministers at an early date[19] and the group in Swansea under the leadership of one John Brown persisted for several years. Samuel Myles, who was especially fond of this little church, often preached at Swansea, lent books to the people and repeatedly wrote to England in their behalf,[20] but the attempt made by the Society to procure a minister for the town was unsuccessful.[21]

The work of John Brown for the Church of England ministry in Swansea was paralleled by that of Col. Vesey in Braintree, a town which lay outside the lines of the non-Congregational influence and would probably not have been affected by the S.P.G. work but for him.

George Keith's report submitted to the society in 1702 stated that the only churches in New England were the one at Boston, the newly founded church at Newport, "and another in Braintry which has no Minister."[22] As early as 1689 there is evidence of Churchmen in Braintree,[23] and in 1702 numerous applications were made in their behalf.[24] The Society responded in the following year by sending William Barclay to the town, but his stay was brief.[25] As a matter of fact that inevitable hostility between the Standing Order and the Churchmen had been increasing and at this time broke out in the prolonged warfare which the town waged over the questions of increasing the minister's salary and forming a second precinct.[26] In the struggle the Standing Order resorted to any means to deride the Churchmen, while the small Episcopal group was not above allying with itself the disaffected of the community.[27]

From the time of Barclay's departure the affairs of Braintree were considered by the Society in connection with the other towns of southeastern Massachusetts, and about them all Henry Compton was very doubtful.[28] Though Myles, who as late as 1708 was writing in their behalf, in time reached the conclusion that the number of sincere Churchmen was too small to warrant sending a missionary,[29] appeals from the various towns continued.[30] The inhabitants of Freetown went so far as to vote in town meeting in 1707 to apply to the Bishop of London for a missionary, arguing that by this means they could free themselves from presentment for lack of a minister.[31] Upon this principle the town pleaded when presented in 1708,[32] but the Court of General Sessions failed to view the matter in the same light, and, upon a petition from the selectmen, who were not in favor of the movement, appointed a minis-

ter for the town.[33]

The Venerable Society in the meantime was having difficulty in procuring preachers for independent villages of the type of Freetown and Tiverton. James Honeyman of Newport who in 1709 began regularly to hold week day lectures in the towns on the eastern shore of the bay, reported that the people were "very ignorant and rude in religious matters,... yet very grave and attentive at Divine worship."[34] Of this same parish William Guy wrote a few years later, that the "generality of the people (as I am well informed) are almost (in all these places) as ignorant as the very Heathens."[35] As the numerous attempts which the Society made to supply this region met with little success, Honeyman continued this work for many years, preaching usually at Tiverton, but also at Freetown and Little Compton.[36]

When in 1712 Thomas Eager was sent by the Society to Braintree he was ordered to preach likewise at Swansea and Little Compton, but distance as foreseen made the task difficult and Eager's speedy departure ended the scheme.[37] The church declined rapidly at this period and no successful attempt was made to revive it for many years.[38] It was at this time that Nicholson took special interest in the situation, recommended a lay reader for Braintree and two itinerants for the whole group of country villages.[39] Neither suggestion was accepted and Honeyman continued his work on the mainland using Tiverton, the most centrally located as his chief place of labor,[40] where he established a regular lecture in a meeting house formerly built for a Congregational minister, but unused at the time.[41] In 1716 Honeyman was ordered to withdraw his services from the eastern shore as it was included in the parish of[42]

William Guy, sent by the Society to officiate at Narragansett, Tiverton, Freetown and Little Compton,[43] but at Guy's sudden departure, he resumed his former labors.[44] In 1721, when some of the inhabitants of the growing town of Bristol made application to the Society for a Church of England minister, giving promises to build a church, the Episcopalians of the neighboring Freetown, Tiverton, Swansea and Little Compton were included.[45] Although James Orem, who arrived in the following year, stayed only a few months,[46] the church began at this time a permanent existence, and was for many years the only Anglican society in southeastern Massachusetts. With the establishment of the church at Providence the Episcopalians of Attleboro and Barrington, Swansea and Rehoboth became associated with this group, but the Bristol church remained the center for Freetown, Tiverton and Little Compton,[47] and Honeyman continued his week-day lecture among them.[48]

In addition to the towns already mentioned there were several others in the region south of Boston which by 1735 numbered some Anglicans among their inhabitants. Until separate churches were founded these scattered people were included in the parish of Christ Church, Boston, and Timothy Cutler often travelled into the country to hold special services. When in 1725 he went to Braintree to administer the sacrament he found the people collecting money to build a small church and anxious to revive the society which had died out a dozen years before.[49] In 1727 the Society responded to their application for a minister[50] and sent over Ebenezer Miller who served the church at Braintree for thirty-four years.[51] The first service held in Scituate was also in 1725 and during the few years Cutler and Miller supplied the town.[52]

A church was built in 1732[53] which accommodated the neighboring towns of Pembroke and Hanover,[54] Marshfield and Halifax,[55] and a minister arrived in the following year.[56] Soon after this Cutler reported preaching at Dedham and at Mendon, the partly Quaker town north of Providence,[57] while the ministers of Braintree and Scituate alternated in officiating at Bridgewater.[58]

Success in the founding of a church in Bristol several years before any other town south of Boston boasted a permanent organization is explicable. Though in the beginning its establishment seems due to the anti-Congregational feeling in the region for which it was county seat, the later history of the church there shows that it was largely economic causes that assured its success. Bristol was a growing commercial town sharing with Providence and Newport the trade of Narragansett Bay. Because of this commerce there was a constant arrival from across the sea of English strangers, many of them Anglican in sympathy.

To this same cause may be traced the early demand for an Episcopal Church in Marblehead, the chief commercial town of northern Massachusetts. John Talbot, preaching at Marblehead in 1707, found the people "terribly pleased (as their phrase is)" and ready to subscribe toward building a church.[60] In 1714 they petitioned the Society for a missionary,[61] who arrived in the person of William Shaw in the following year.[62] In succeeding years Marblehead became the center for the Church service in the region north of Boston and had many communicants in the neighboring coast town of Salem which in 1734 erected a church of its own.[63]

There were also by 1735 churchmen in the towns of Ipswich,[64] Newbury, Amesbury and Salisbury, in the vicinity of Portsmouth, New

Hampshire and in the Maine towns of York, Kittery and Piscataqua.[65] One of these, Newbury, was the first community in the province outside of Boston to organize permanently an Anglican church and to be supplied with a resident missionary. The movement was however not caused by a Church of England group within the town but came out of a long protracted struggle between two factions in the precinct Congregational Church of West Newbury. The minority, angered by the actions of their opponents and a General Court order in favor of the latter, were approached by John Bridger of Portsmouth, N.H. surveyor general of Her Majesty's forests, and agreed at his suggestion to proclaim a definite schism from their neighbors by declaring for the Church of England.[66] Bridger assured the people that if they would petition for a Church of England minister, they would be freed from contributing to the precinct church, while a missionary would come supplied with a salary by the Society. This argument was of importance in effecting the results, but later events proved that a misunderstanding had occurred.[67]

John Lambton, a chaplain of the Queen's navy, officiated in Newbury for a short time in 1713-1714, and was succeeded by Henry Lucas, an eccentric man, who painted a picture of his unusual parish in dark colors. According to Lucas the first steps were taken to frighten the precinct, never with the thought that the Honorable Society would actually grant the petition and send a minister.[68] While there doubtless were several sincere Churchmen among the apostates of Newbury, the group as a whole was, according to Benjamin Colman, simply a typical country church faction, possessing, in the matter of church practices, those very prejudices which made them look with horrorupon such tendencies as the Brattle

Street church represented, and as far from Episcopacy as could well be imagined.[69]

From this review of the work of the S.P.G. in rural Massachusetts it will appear that in its beginning and during the first ten years of the Society's history it was little more than the local application of the great Anglican-Quaker struggle going on in all the colonies. By the end of that time the Church had found a foothold and other causes accounted for its growth. These were principally two, - the increase of the over-sea element in the commercial towns of the province, and the subsequent proselytizing from the churches of the standing order. A town quarrel was the basis of the introduction of the Anglican service at Newbury, and in various other communities local disagreements helped to feed the missionary establishment of the Church of England.

Coincident with this second phase of the Church's development in the province, came a new alignment of parties. The Massachusetts Congregationalist had come to see in the Anglican minister not a missionary to "Quaker and irreligious" towns or to the Indian natives, but rather the representative of an organization and practice which the Puritan of two generations before had come into the wilderness to escape, and which in spreading would exert a political as well as a religious influence which might prove hostile to the system of the land. Succeeding years therefore witnessed the conflict between the ecclesiastical laws of Massachusetts and the demands of the Anglican churches throughout the province.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had scarcely begun its work when it discovered the difficulty which it had to

meet in Massachusetts where a state church was supported by public taxation.[70] As early as 1703 the Churchmen in Braintree appealed to Joseph Dudley, asking that the governor and council would order that their estates need not be taxed for ministerial support until a legal trial be held or Her Majesty's pleasure be known.[71] Not receiving satisfaction at that time they were in 1710 complaining to the Bishop of London that they were termed Papists and Idolaters and their worship called the mass, while their estates were forcibly taken from them "by those whose wills are the measure of their actions, for the support of Dissenting ministers."[72]

It is not without some significance that it was the church at Newbury which was the first to go systematically to work and not altogether ineffectively to gain exemption. Disgust at ministerial assessments, levied upon them after they supposed they would be immune, was united to a certain resentment long felt against their fellow townsmen. The attempt made early in 1712 to collect from them a ministerial tax, voted before the schism, was the cause of an appeal which they made to Dudley. The petition stated that it was "a thing unknown in her Majesty's dominions that the members of the Church of England should be forced to contribute to the support of the tolerated dissenting Teachers."[73]

Dudley's relation to religious and ecclesiastical concerns within his province was a curious one. Born in Massachusetts, of an old family of the standing order, he was trained in all the customs of his native land and was a member of the church in Roxbury. But while governor of the Isle of Wight he became a communicant of the Church of England; in 1701 he was made correspondent of the S.P.C.K. for that province,[74] and later a member of the S.P.G.,[75]

becoming a strong supporter of its work.[76] Returning to New England he soon found that he had incurred the hatred of his own circle, but was at the same time never able to gain the full confidence of Massachusetts Churchmen.[77] This result came as an inevitable consequence of his application in ecclesiastical affairs of his theories as a representative of the British imperial system.

His affiliation with the Anglican Church was a practical expression of his advocacy of the enforcement of English law. In his dealings with the religious parties in New England he was above all eager to suppress petty jealousies, to placate the varicus parties, and by the arrangement of compromises to allay the strife of religious factions as he succeeded to a certain extent with political ones.

It was with this object in view that he had given an impression of friendliness to the Quakers, John Tucker, Richard Borden, Joseph Wanton and Ebenezer Slocum while doing little for them.

The same principle he applied in dealing with the Anglicans.[78] Knowing that the matter presented by the representatives of the church at Newbury was outside of his authority he was however anxicus to remedy the situation. The result of his consideration was embodied in a communication to the Justices of Essex County, dated 28 Feb. 1711/12. After reciting the situation presented in the Newbury petition Dudley concluded, "I am therefore of opinion that the said Petitioners and others that join with them ought to be peaceably allowed in their lawful proceedings therein for their good establishment and ought not to be taxed or imposed upon for the support and maintenance of any other public worship in the said Town, of wch I desire all persons concerned to take notice accordingly."[79]

This was no order but a mere recommendation, though the Honorable Society always thought otherwise and was led by Dudley so to believe.[80] This encouragement prompted the Churchmen of Newbury to go on with their church building and continue resistance to taxation, but the other townsmen were no less determined upon success. Imprisonment followed,[81] from which in the first instance Dudley issued a discharge. A later suit resulted in an appeal to the Inferior Court of Common Pleas which upon a technicality reversed the judgment previously submitted by the Justices of Essex County.[82] This result was in large part due to Sir Francis Nicholson to whom the Newbury Churchmen had applied for aid,[83] as the chief patron of the Church in the colonies. Nicholson employed counsel from his own fortune and went to work with the double purpose of freeing the prisoners and discovering whether there was real authority for their imprisonment. He would doubtless have made a strong appeal to the home government had he found any illegality in the latter, but in this he was disappointed.
He did however write to the Society[84] while Bridger applied to Dudley. Whatever the governor may have done at this time the west precinct of Newbury registered its understanding of the recent turn of events had taken by voting, 2 April 1714, "to free all those persons that are or shall be for the Episcopal way of worship in ye Precinct from paying any rates to the maintenance of ye Ministry amongst us."[85] Though an attempt was later made to revive the tax, matters were for the time being quiet.

During the course of these proceedings in Newbury the Churchmen of Braintree began to take similar measures regarding their treatment at the hands of the standing order. Early in 1713, soon after the coming of Eager, a petition signed by William Vesey and

others, and asking that they be freed from ecclesiastical charges was presented to the Governor and council.[86] It was considered on May 7 and then referred to the General Court on the ground that it lay within the authority of that body.[87] The petition was accordingly tendered to the General Court in June[88] but the latter took advantage of a technicality and refused to consider it.[89]

It was at this point that Eager sent an appeal to the Venerable Society. "We cannot find," said he, "that any of our Communion upon this Northern part of this Continent are obliged to support the Dissenters, but this poor handful of this Town only."[90] Eager's letter produced a communication from the secretary to Governor Dudley.[91] "The Society conceive this to be a very great hardship," ran the letter, "and apprehend it is very much in your Excellency's power to do and procure to be done that which is just and equal to such who are so oppressed, and the rather because they observe in a Letter from your Excellency to the late Lord Bishop of London of the 19th December last, you are pleased to say, that as to such Inhabitants who had declared for the Church of England you had at their request exempted them from payment of taxes to any other Ministers but of the Church."[92] Such a statement shows how Dudley had succeeded in giving the Bishop of London a different impression from what was actually the case. In his relation to the Episcopal churches of the province Dudley had not gone farther than to make recommendations to the Justices of Essex County, and those only in regard to the single town of Newbury.[93] The Society believed that he had issued general orders and upon this supposition based their appeal to him in the present case. Dudley must have felt some uneasiness at the misunderstanding for he hastened to write,

1 May 1714, to explain to the secretary that what he had formerly said referred only to Newbury. He was however not obliged to confess that this had been nothing but a statement of opinion. Between his two letters affairs at Newbury had developed, and he was now able torecord the vote of the west precinct which exempted Anglicans from ministerial charges.[94]

The matter of Braintree was dropped soon after this because of the departure of Eager and the decline of the church.

During the administration of Joseph Dudley the principal application made by the Massachusetts Churchmen for relief from ministerial taxes were to the governor. His effort to smooth matters over and give an appearance of authority prevented the Anglican element from carrying many urgent appeals to the Bishop of London or the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Had such appeals been made at this time and solicitations in England followed, it is possible that results for the provincial Churchmen might have been obtained which were long postponed by the death of the strenuous Henry Compton and of Queen Anne.

Lieutenant-Governor William Tailer who acted as chief executive for the year between Dudley's removal and the appointment of Shute had the confidence of the Anglican ministers in the province as well as of the Society,[95] but was not called upon to settle any questions of church and state.

His successor Samuel Shute, although belonging to an English nonconforming family[96] became a member of the S.P.G.[97] and pledged himself to support its missionaries.[98] He had occasion to frame a very definite policy regarding the Episcopal churches of the province, and took matters into his own hands. With him a deter-

mination to enforce English law was unaccompanied, as in the case of Dudley, with political astuteness and an understanding of New England institutions, so that he was induced to stretch his prerogative in dealing with the Anglican churches.

Not long after Shute's arrival the wardens and vestry of the church at Marblehead presented him with the grievances which they felt in being forced to contribute to the support of dissenting ministers. The governor's response gave temporary satisfaction. He seems to have sent a communication to the selectmen of the town to the effect that the Churchmen ought not to be taxed.[99] The feeling of security which this support gave the church at Marblehead[100] was in reality unfounded for the selectmen of the town defied Shute's recommendation. The assessors proceeded once more to rate the Churchmen to the support of the ministry and the constables to distrain their goods.[101] Mossom, who in the meantime had succeeded Shaw,[102] wrote to the secretary asking that the Society would communicate with Shute and secure his intercession for his parishioners.[103] Without waiting for this suggestion to take effect he applied to the governor himself in a petition dated June 27, 1722, with the request that His Excellency would be pleased "effectually to interpose" and require the Justices of the Peace and selectmen to exempt members of the church in Marblehead.[104] The result was highly satisfactory to the Anglicans as Shute assumed authority. He immediately addressed an order to the Justices of the Peace and the selectmen of the town of Marblehead requiring them to forbear laying any taxes upon people belonging to the English Church of the town toward the support of "any dissenting Minister."[105]

Although this order had no effect upon the town or county officials it inspired the Churchmen of Newbury to make a like appeal. Disregarding its vote of April 2,1714 the town had recently renewed the taxation of Churchmen. Just one month after issuing the order in regard to Marblehead, Shute wrote a similar one upon Newbury to the Justices of the Peace.[106] It is probable that he repeated the same for Bristol at about this time.[107]

In no one of the towns which Shute favored was his order obeyed. At Marblehead the goods of two men were distrained and several others threatened, upon which Mossom in December 1722 petitioned the justices at General Sessions, but succeeded only in getting them to write a letter to the town urging the people to be at peace.[108] In Newbury the situation was similar,[109] and in Bristol a number of persons were imprisoned[110] for failure to pay to the support of the newly arrived Congregational minister, Nathaniel Cotton.[111]

At this point occurred the sudden departure for England of his Excellency Samuel Shute, and the Episcopal clergymen, in continuing their business with the provincial government, found themselves facing the lieutenant-governor Jeremiah Dummer.
From the first Dummer announced a policy very different from his predecessor's. While willing to arrange the differencies in the Episcopal towns of the province, he recognized far better than Shute what was his own relation to the law. As a native New Englander like Dudley, he was aware that if concessions were to be made they must come from the legislative and not the executive body. Orem and Mossom both addressed Dummer soon after Shute's departure and were pleasantly received, with the promise from the governor

that he would use his influence in their favor.[112] He explained however and iterated many times in the following months, when approached on the same subject, that the laws of the province absolutely supported what the selectmen and constables were doing, so that relief must come in the way of legislation through the General Court.

While Dummer was announcing these facts to the New England clergman, events were occurring in England which soon exerted an important influence upon conditions in Massachusetts. In 1723 John Robinson, Bishop of London and diocesan of the colonies, was succeeded by Edmund Gibson whose ideas in regard to the supremacy of the English Church and the importance of ecclesiastical control in America resembled the theories of Henry Compton. In Compton's time the number of Anglicans in New England was so small, and Dudley had been so eager to keep the religious elements in some degree of quiet, that the complaints which had reached the Bishop and the Society had not created any great disturbance.

Under Shute's government the dissatisfaction with conditions had become more expressive but the Society, not prodded by an active bishop, turned the matter over to the governor, and Shute, by assuming an unconstitutional authority, relieved the Society of further responsibility in the matter. The legal status of the Massachusetts Churchman was not appreciated by the Venerable Society in these years.

The change came at about the time of Gibson's translation to the see of London. He could not have been long in his new position when he received an elaborate communication drawn up by Orem and Mossom soon after the imprisonments at Bristol, seconded by Samuel Myles and Henry Harris of Boston, and urging the presentation

of a petition to the King asking for relief.[113] Gibson's immediate reply was a letter to the lieutenant-governor asking for his protection to the clergy of the province,[114] but with characteristic force he went farther. Wishing to understand better ecclesiastical conditions of the colonies, Edmund Gibson at once sent out a set of queries to the various commissaries of his predecessor. Among them was the question: "What public Acts of Assembly have been made & confirmed, relating to the Church or Clergy within that Govt?" The reply made by Samuel Myles, answering for Massachusetts, said: "There are Several laws for the Establishing of Independants, & Settling Orthodox Ministers chosen by the people. The Church of England only indulged, as the Anabaptists & Quakers for never in any of the Laws is the case supposed that the clergy of the Chh of Engld, should be here Supported." "It would tend very much to the advantage of the Church, and comfort of the Clergy," he continued, in reply to another question, "if the members of the Chh were freed from any compulsion to pay to the independant ministers, as they are forced to do in many places Particularly in Bristol where the Church people have been imprisoned for not paying their rates towards the maintenance of Mr. Cotton a Dissenting Minister of that Town."[115]

Even before this information could have reached Gibson, the Society was giving serious attention to an account from Mossom of difficulties at Marblehead and of Shute's order. His letter was referred to a committee "to inspect the Laws of that Country, and to examine what has been the practice in other Church of England churches in New England, and also what has been the Usage and Practice in other Governments where the Church of England is the Established Church."[116] The result of this committee's investigation

showed that "every person is rateable by the Governmt there to pay to the Minister chose by the Majority of each Town."[117]

This information, with the facts which the Society was constantly receiving from the Massachusetts clergy and churches, resulted in a new line of action for which Gibson was probably responsible. Shute, who was present at a number of the Society's meetings and was now aware of the unconstitutional position which he had previously taken,[118] was instructed to write to the lieutenant-governor to use what influence he could. But it was agreed that if Dummer's efforts with the General Court failed, the matter would be taken to the proper place,- the King in Council.[119]

The course of these events was interuupted by another ecclesiastical question in which the Bishop of London had been much concerned. In May 1725 the ministers of Massachusetts made their second attempt to secure governmental sanction for the holding of a synod.[120] A petition from the convention of ministers in Boston was presented to the General Court on May 27. Ten years earlier the New England Yearly Meeting had done its utmost to prevent the sanction of such a synod. Now it was the Boston clergymen who were on the alert before the Yearly Meeting had gathered. Their point of attackwas similar to that which the Quakers had taken,- that approval in England of such an act would be the recognition of the Congregational Church as the established church of Massachusetts.

The dismissal by the Representatives of a petition from Myles and Cutler against the ministers' memorial was the occasion of an appeal from Myles directly to the Bishopof London. Edmund Gibson, in presenting the case to the Duke of Newcastle dwelt upon the constitutional phase of the question,- the legal

status of the Church of England in the colonies.[121] Beyond that were the unfortunate results which might occur in England should such a privilege be granted. An example must not be given either to the lower clergy or to the nonconformists. A Whig decision between nonconformists and Anglicans was likely to favor nonconformity rather than churchmanship, but the question was presented in such a way that other interests were at stake. The matter was hurried through the necessary bodies and a judgment rendered which satisfied the higher clergy. Dummer received from the Privy Council a rebuke for his failure to veto the bill,[122] and the matter never came up again in the General Court.

The year following Shute's letter to Dummer saw the arrival of fresh information from Massachusetts but no account of success in the legislature. Relying perhaps upon the outcome of the synod project the Society in September 1726, after rereading two special communications, one from the clergy of New England and the other from Mossom, decided that a committee should be appointed to draw up a representation to lay before His Majesty.[123] In the following month a petition framed by this committee was read before the Society "concerning the Members of the Church of England in Connecticut Colony and Massachusetts Bay in New England who are aggrieved in being forced to pay towards the Maintenance of Independent or Dissenting Teachers." William Sharpe was secured to act as counsel and the treasury of the Society was put at the disposal of the committee which was asked to present the Massachusetts and Connecticut laws to the Attorney and Solicitor General for their opinion whether the colonies by virtue of their Charters had power to make such laws "in prejudice of the Church of England."[124] In consequence of the

opinion rendered Sharpe was ordered to draw up a representation "in the name of the private Persons who have sent over complaints of their Grievances, to be laid before his Majesty."[125] This petition was lodged in the Council office March 20, on May 13 referred to committee, and on July 14 passed on to the Board of Trade,[126] which considered it on November 10.[127] The document in many respects resembled the Quaker appeal of 1723 but went farther.

While the Quakers had been concerned with a disallowance of a particular law the Anglicans asked for the "repeal" of the whole mass of Massachusetts ecclesiastical legislation under the province charter as inconsistent with the religious provisions of that document.[128]

On November 14 the Board of Trade, with the Bishop of London present, gave directions for writing to the Attorney and Solicitor General for their opinion whether the said acts were repugnant to the charter and if so whether it was in the King's power to repeal them.[129]

The failure of the Board to secure any answer at this time must have been due in part to the political situation. The failure of the Bishop of London and the Society to push the matter farther was in a measure at least occasioned by the Massachusetts law of December 19, 1727.

The solicitation of Dummer by the Venerable Society, falling in as it did with his own policy, was not without effect, though the progress of events was slow. One of the chief difficulties which had developed in Massachusetts was the imprisonment or distraint of Anglicans in outlying towns who attempted to attend the church service in Bristol, or in Newport, or Providence, outside of Massachusetts jurisdiction.[130] Among the northern towns which experienced the same trouble in less degree was Marblehead whose church had several mem-

bers living in Salem. The case of Philip English was carried by petition before the lieutenant-governor in the winter of 1725 and he ordered a speedy compromise.[131] Although Salem greatly resented this interference, a large part of the rate was remitted.[132] Dummer showed on all these occasions a steady support of the Anglican clergy and churches,[133] but disappointed the clergy in his continued policy of noninterference. In repeated complaints to Dummer Matthias Plant of Newbury attempted to gain redress for a number of his parishioners living north of the Merrimac River, in the town of Amesbury, where they were rated to the minister of that town. The governor received Plant cordially and went so far as to write to the selectmen of Amesbury, urging them not to molest the Churchmen, until the pleasure of the General Court was known, but the measure was ineffective.[134]

The efforts made by Plant were contemporaneous with the second founding of the church in Braintree which was hardly on its feet before it attempted to gain the governor's order which the other churches in Shute's time had secured. Plant's final memorial and one from Braintree were before the Governor's Council on the same day, November 30,1726. While Dummer recognized that action on this question, to be valid, must come from the General Court he had in mind and did propose that a law should immediately be made "that the taxes of those belonging to the Church of England be paid by the collectors to the Ministers of the Church of England to whom they severally do belong." A committee was appointed, Dummer intending that it might report some such measure to recommend to the lower house, but it dismissed the question, merely expressing its opinion that such applications should be made directly to the whole

court.[135]

Braintree attempted such application, but its memorial was thrown out by the Representatives so promptly that Newbury declined the suggestion. Plant, to whom Dummer explained the case, refused to approach anyone but the governor on the ground that the Bishop of London and the Honorable Society were expecting the Church people to be "protected from rates only by his Honor's orders." To this Dummer replied that "by this time he believed his Lordship, the Bishop of London, and the Society were better informed vizt, that he could not do it."[136] Not long afterwards Dummer carried out his policy in regard to Braintree by writing a letter to Col. Quincy, who was then a member of the Council, asking him to use his influence in adjusting the Anglican difficulties in the town.[137]

Discouraged by the events of November 1726, both Newbury and Braintree gave up hope of obtaining anything from the local government and turned again to the Bishop of London and the Venerable Society. Plant's letter to the secretary was dated December 20, 1726,[138] and a memorial from Braintree to Nicholson eight days later. "We have done making Application to the Authority here," ran the Braintree statement, "and are quite tired, as you may see by the papers we have sent... to be laid before his Lordship & the Honble Society."[139]

In spite of his apparent failures it was the attitude of Dummer which forced upon the General Court some action regarding the exemption of Anglicans. Letters from the Bishop of London and from the secretary of the Society with the continuous stream of complaints from Bristol and Marblehead, Newbury and Braintree only strengthened his own opinion of the general wisdom of such action.

The General Court had repeatedly thrown out applications from members of dissenting sects but by 1727 conditions had somewhat changed. On December 5,1727 there was read in the Governor's Council a proposed act which was little more than a repetition of the scheme which Dummer had outlined in a letter to Plant just twelve months before. Its origin in substance then may be traced to the lieutenant-governor. Its passage in the lower house was due to the events which had occurred in England since the assembly, a year earlier, had thrown out the Braintree memorial. In the spring of the year (1727) news had reached Massachusetts of the progress of the petition which Gibson and the Society were following from Privy Council to Board of Trade.[140] The decision of the crown lawyers regarding the tax act of 1722, rendered three years before this, and of the letter sent to Dummer by the Privy Council in regard to sanctioning a synod, were fresh in the minds of the Representatives. The assembly was inclined to believe that a partial exemption of Churchmen, scarcely more than many of them already had secured was better than a disastrous decision. The Council, already inclined to favor Quakers, made no opposition.[141] On December 7 the act was passed in the upper house, was read in the assembly, and finally on the twelfth concurred in with certain amendments.[142]

This act of December 19,1727, which was in reality an act for the settlement and support of ministers, contained a clause which gave a limited exemption to Anglicans. Ministerial rates were to be collected from them as usual but the money of those who lived within five miles of an Anglican church where there was a "person in orders according to the rules of the Church of England" should be turned over by the collectors to the Episcopal minister.

The Churchmen were also exempt from paying to the building of meeting houses. A proviso however limited the usefulness of the act. It was stated that if a deficiency occurred in the salary of the Congregational minister by reason of this arrangement, a second assessment could be made in which Churchmen were to be included.[143]

Very general dissatisfaction was felt at so slight a concession. The five mile radius was particularly trying in the parish of the Bristol church; the probability of a second assessment was a cause of complaint; the temporary character of the act was annoying.[144] The people of Barrington and Rehoboth who had joined with the new church at Providence were particularly stirred because no arrangement had been made to cover their position.[145]

Gibson soon learned of the passage of the act[146] and on June 21,1728 laid it before the Society with criticism. The S.P.G. immediately instructed Sharpe to enquire at the Board of Trade when the act arrived and inform the Society ,that it might be followed to the Privy Council.[147] The bishop also wrote to William Burnet, the newly appointed governor of Massachusetts, but Burnet was too deeply concerned with the salary question between himself and the assembly to do anything more than send a friendly reply to Gibson.[148]

Since November 14,1727 the petition which the Venerable Society had drawn up in the name of the Massachusetts clergymen had lodged with the Attorney and Solicitor General, and was neglected for various reasons. The passage of the act of 1727 somewhat altered the situation but a new petition was not immediately framed. Sharpe on May 21,1729 at last succeeded in securing an order from

the Board that Popple should write again to the Attorney and Solicitor General to remind them that no answer had been made to the question submitted November 14,1727, but nothing came of this.[149]

Two years more passed before the English Churchmen were able to secure the attention which they desired. By that time the Massachusetts act of 1727 had arrived officially, as well as the first Quaker and Baptist legislation which made better concessions than the earlier act had given to the Anglicans.[150] Dissatisfaction with the act of 1727 was expressed in a petition drawn up again in the name of Timothy Cutler to the King in Council which on October 28, 1731 was considered and referred to the Lords Committee.[151] On November 1 it was passed on to the Board of Trade[152] who gave it their consideration. This second petition reminded the Board that it had failed to return a report on the earlier memorial but stated that the situation was now somewhat changed by the legislature of 1727. The objections to the recent act were set forth. Finally His Majesty was besought once more to consider the various acts before mentioned as well as the present law, take action upon them and enjoin the governor not to pass any act for the future "whereby any Tax shall be laid on the Members of one perswasion for the support of the ministers of any other."[153] As in the former case the Board of Trade, receiving the petition on November 30,1731, read it and referred it (5 January 1731/32) to the Attorney and Solicitor General with a second reminder of the letter of November 14,1727.[154]

In the meantime the arrival of Governor Belcher with his friendly attitude toward the Quakers of Massachusetts Bay had caused among the Anglicans of New England a greater commotion than the

feeble Quaker legislation of 1728 and 1729 had produced.
While the Quaker bill of 1731 was drafting by a committee of the lower house Roger Price, in his new official capacity as commissary for New England, presented a memorial to the Governor, Council and House of Representatives in behalf of the Churchmen.[155]
Belcher in receiving his appointment had been given instructions which contained a new clause bearing on ecclesiastical matters. The recent legal recognition of the Bishop of London's jurisdiction in the colonies was now particularly drawn to the various governors' attention with the charge that they give special care to encouraging the bishop's commissaries in their duties.[156] In spite of Belcher's strong anti-Episcopal feeling he was prepared for political reasons to do what was necessary to satisfy Anglican interests in England, and now promised his support.[157]

The committee of the General Court in whose hands the affair was placed was not inclined to make immediate concessions and asked for further proof of disabilities under existing legislation. In spite of immediate action by the joint vestries of King's Chapel and Christ Church, with financial support, nothing came of this petition. Upon receiving news of its failure they proceeded to draw up a further memorial to present to the King in Council,[158] and solicited contributions from the rural churches of New England.[159]
On Feb. 7, 1731/32 the new petition was considered by the vestries of the two Boston churches and ordered sent to the Bishop of London; Thomas Sandford was chosen as agent to prosecute the petition to the King and a local committee was appointed to correspond with him and forward money. John Checkley at this time went into the rural towns to get the memorial signed and to obtain further evidence of dis-

160
traint.

This petition had no immediate result as the Bishop of London was still busy with the Massachusetts memorial of 1731 for which the Board of Trade's attention had been recently secured. Certain difficulties which made it impossible to gain the attention of authority in 1727 had now been overcome and an opinion from the Attorney and Solicitor General was at last secured, August 16, 1732.
Taking up the first petition, drawn before the act of 1727 and complaining of Massachusetts ecclesiastical law, the lawyers pointed out that of the acts therein mentioned the first three had been duly confirmed by the crown, and the subsequent ones had become law when not within the alloted time disallowed in England. In either case such laws could not be repealed by His Majesty without the concurrence of the Massachusetts General Court. The lawyers next proceeded to consider whether the acts were repugnant to the charter and hence void from the beginning. They pointed out that while the charter granted liberty of conscience it did neither institute nor expressly prohibit a provincial church to be established in the colony. To provide for the celebration of the public worship of God and for the maintenance of ministers did not seem to them inconsistent with liberty of conscience. Even if the acts were illegal no extrajudicial declaration could pronounce them so; a judicial proceeding on a test case was necessary. The act of 1727, discussed in the second petition, Yorke and Talbot were asked to pass upon in point of law. But, as they said, it was not a legal objection which was entered against it but prudential, the act not
161
going far enough to please the people whom it was framed to pacify.

Edmund Gibson, when informing Price of this action by the

law officers of the crown, expressed the regret that the Church had not taken steps earlier and before the power which the Massachusetts dissenters exercised had become so well established.[162] It is possible that an application in Queen Anne's reign might have proved effective, but for political reasons in England rather than in Massachusetts Bay. The Hanoverian succession with its substantial Whig support had altered conditions among English Churchmen, and these conditions were reflected in America. There was little chance of obtaining any legal opinion, at the expense of dissenters, from law officers of the crown during the Walpole regime. Other decisions resembled this one. Gibson was forced to confess that his influence at court was too weak to oppose the party strength of the dissenting interests.[163]

In spite of this condition and the unwillingness of the Honorable Society to push matters under such circumstances, the united vestries of King's Chapel and Christ Church were determined to go farther. Meeting June 26 and October 19,1733 they voted to try the one remaining mode of procedure,- a test case. A committee was accordingly appointed to prosecute such officers as distrained or imprisoned members of the Church of England in the province, to defend Churchmen in travelling to church on Sunday and Church of England ministers for marrying in the manner of the Church.[164] This measure was followed by a vigorous prosecution of the case of Matthew Ellis of Medford who, upon imprisonment for failure to pay a ministerial tax sued Richard Sprague the constable. The case went through the Inferior Court of Common Pleas, the Superior Court and the Court of Review. An appeal was denied by the judges of the Superior Court, but was granted by the King in

Council and Sprague was summoned to appear before a committee of the Privy Council to answer for the imprisonment of Ellis.[165]

Meanwhile the Bishop of London, who had met best success when dealing with the Massachusetts governor, applied once more to the same authority, and Belcher now, as Dummer formerly, assumed certain responsibility. The General Court was once more led to consider the disabilities of Churchmen and, probably influenced by the recent action of the Boston Episcopal churches, took up the question of exemption. On July 4,1734 the Baptists were given the same privileges which the Quakers had obtained two years and a half before, and on December 27,1735 the Anglicans received a similar recognition.

This law, though not proving entirely satisfactory to the Church of England in the province, did away with the two chief objections to the act of 1727. While it provided merely for a return of taxes rather than a clear exemption as in the case of the Baptists and Quakers, and still included Churchmen in a possible second assessment, it took a step forward in its abolition of the five mile clause. A system of identification, similar to the Baptist and Quaker method, was instituted, the minister and church wardens to indicate to the town treasurer who were members of or gave attendance at the Anglican church. The act was in force for five years.[166]

The passage of these two acts, the Baptists and Anglican laws of 1734 and 1735, rendered practically unimportant the action taken by the Board of Trade and the Privy Council immediately afterwards. At the failure of the petitions in the name of Timothy Cutler which had absorbed the attention of the Bishop of London and

the S.P.G., a failure caused by the unsympathetic decision by Yorke and Talbot,- there still lay before the bishop the Quaker legislation against which King's Chapel and Christ Church were working. At the beginning of the year 1736 Gibson and William Sharpe were on the alert regarding it,[167] as a decision was imminent, but the result was not all that might have been desired. The real problem was avoided. In accordance with a report submitted by the Board of Trade the Lords Committee (2 Feb.1735/36) stated that as the charter granted liberty of conscience to all Christians except Roman Catholics, such exemption ought not to be limited to any one sect of Protestants but extended to all. It was therefore considered not proper for His Majesty's approbation and was only saved from an unfavorable recommendation by its temporary character, as it was about to expire. The Board of Trade was ordered to draft an additional instruction to Belcher to restrain him from giving his assent in the future to any law of this kind unless the exemption be made general.[168] This order was read at the Board March 18,1736.

Belcher was not given an opportunity to show his recognition of thisorder as there was no attempt to pass further exemption laws during his term of office. Each of the three important dissenting sects had secured a tolerable arrangement which though irritating was not impracticable. The Anglican law of 1735 was made perpetual in 1742.[169]

The Episcopalians of Massachusetts were behind the Quakers in beginning their struggle to resist maintaining the state-church, as there were very few of them in the province until after the founding of the S.P.G. When once started, the struggle resembled the Quaker conflict in the support which it received at home

when it met failure in Boston, and in its dependence for success upon political conditions. If the Board of Trade was forced to make recommendationson a question involving two dissenting sects results were likely to depend upon the political bearing.
The Quakers, as an influential body in England had the advantage over Massachusetts Congregationalists because of the independent attitude which the Massachusetts General Court was maintaining in relation to the Board of Trade. In a question between Anglican and dissenter the latter had, under the Walpole regime, a distinct advantage. This advantage was lost only when other considerations involving low church vs. high church or Anglican vs. the Massachusetts General Court played their part. The Massachusetts provincial governors understood that their function in ecclesiastical matters was to use their influence in suppressing warring religious factions, and to favor the Church of England when possible.
By Dudley this was expressed in his friendly consideration of Quaker and Anglican petitions to Governor and Council, in the discharge of ecclesiastical prisoners of either body, and in his recommendations to stubborn towns. Shute, less well versed in colonial legislation, carried this policy to the overstepping of his prerogative in making orders regarding the treatment of Anglicans. Dummer recognized that relief for "dissenting sects" must come from action by the General Court, and used his influence to accomplish this end so effectively that the Massachusetts act of 1727 contained a clause with a partial exemption of Anglicans, while the Quakers and Baptists soon received similar recognition.

The basic causes which made these results for Anglicans possible were the measures which were taken in England by the

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel upon the recommendations of the Bishop of London. The Massachusetts Churchmen had early begun to make application to the Society and to the bishop for relief from ecclesiastical charges, and some recommendations had come to Dudley, Tailer and Shute. But the number of Churchmen in Massachusetts outside of the capital city was not large and opportunity to accomplish something before the death of Queen Anne was lost.

A little later belief that Shute had authority and was exercising it relieved the Society of responsibility. A better appreciation of the legal status of Episcopacy in Massachusetts came to the S.P.G. at about the time that Gibson succeeded Robinson in the see of London, and under his influence the Society took up seriously the problem of gaining exemption for New England Anglicans.

After a study of Massachusetts ecclesiastical law and an appeal to Dummer to use his influence the Society agreed to carry the affair to the proper place in England and address His Majesty, but action was delayed by political causes. The act passed in Massachusetts (1727), contained an Anglican exemption clause prompted by the course of events in England. It proved however so unsatisfactory that the S.P.G. agreed to revive their previous attempt with the crown,- a decision strengthened by the Massachusetts Quaker laws of 1728, 1729 and 1731. The influence of the Bishop of London was not sufficient to gain results satisfactory to ecclesiastical interests, but again the General Court was guided by the Governor's attitude and the progress of events in England. The act of 1735 became law and in 1742 was made perpetual.

NOTES.

1. The relation between the government and the English colonial church during the reigns of Anne and the Georges may be followed in the Journals of the S.P.G. Among the favorable actions taken in the later years of Anne's reign may be mentioned the Order in Council granting appeal from inferior courts to the Queen in Council without limitation, in ecclesiastical cases, S.P.G. Letters, A VII, No. 49, Report of Board of Trade, 25 Nov. 1712; S.P.G. Journal, II, 212, 214, 258, July 1712--Jan. 1712/13; the ready extension of the Queen's bounty to the Society's missionaries, Fothergill, List of Emigrant Ministers to America, 1690--1811; S.P.G. Journal, II, 341; Popple to the Sec'y, 3 Feb. 1703/04, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 26; Queen Anne's approval of a colonial bishop, Cross, Ang. Episc., 101; S.P.G. Journal, II, 381. Under George I the attempt to establish bishoprics in America was abandoned, Cross, Ang. Episc., 101; S.P.G. Journal, IV, 94, 4 Mar. 1719/20; and the whole period of the Walpole regime was full of disappointments. See attempt to have New Jersey act in favor of Quakers disallowed, S.P.G. Journal, III, 69, 372, 385, 412; IV, 1--2, 11, 1 July 1715--19 Dec. 1718; question of the lands in St. Christopher, S.P.G. Journal, IV, 94, 96, March 1719/20; Maryland act regarding ministers' salaries, S.P.G. Journal, V, 210, 211--12, 216, 225, June--Nov. 1729; bill in Parliament to restrain the disposition of lands, S.P.G. Journal, VII, 22, 23, 35, March--May 1736.

2. Compton made an attempt to secure a legal basis for his authority in the colonies; he obtained from Charles II a bounty of twenty pounds for each minister and schoolmaster going to the West Indies; he instituted the practice of appointing commissaries;

he was instrumental in securing the charter of the S.P.G. Cross, Ang. Episc., 25--36.

3. Cross, Ang. Episc., 31; Dickerson, Am. Col. Gov't., 19.

4. Dickerson, Am. Col. Gov't., 123--127.

5. The Massachusetts act of 1702 for the settlement and support of ministers was opposed by Compton before the Board of Trade, but his recommendations did not result in its disallowance. Mass. Prov. Laws, I, 509.

6. "A General Plan of the Constitution of a Protestant Congregation or Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." Allen and McClure, 200 years of the S.P.C.K., 22.

7. "To reduce the Quakers, who are so numerous in those parts, to the Christian Faith, from which they are totally Apostatiz'd, and so may be look'd upon as a Heathen Nation, it were to be wish'd that a support could be provided for some Missionaries to be sent amongst them, in order to convert them, in the manner that George Keith does travail amongst them here in England to that blessed end, and not without good success." "Memorial given in by Dr. Bray." Allen and McClure, 200 years of the S.P.C.K., 23; John Chamberlayne to Elias Neau, Oct. 1700. Ibid, 227.

8. "In ROAD-ISLAND, for want of a Clergy, many of the Inhabitants are said to be sunk downright into Atheism. The New Generation, being the Off-spring of Quakers, whose Children, for want of an Outward Teaching, which those Enthusiasts at first denied, being meer Ranters; as indeed the Sons of Quakers are found to be such in most Places, and equally to deny all Religion!...."Nor do I think myself oblig'd to speak here of New-England, where Independency seems to be the Religion of the Country. My design is not to

intermeddle, where Christianity under any Form has obtained Possession, but to represent rather the deplorable State of the English Colonies, where they have been in a manner abandoned to Atheism; or, which is much at one, to Quakerism, for want of a Clergy settled among them." Bray, A Memorial representing the Present State of Religion on the continent of North America, London 1700. Printed in Steiner, Bray, 159 ff.

9. S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 26; A II, No. 148. See also references to this society in S.P.G. Journal, II, 259-266, 16 Jan. and 13 Feb. 1712/13.

10. Edward Bromfield to Thomas Bromfield, 9 Oct. 1704, S.P.G. Letters, A II, No. 29; Edward Bromfield to the Sec'y, 24 Feb. 1707, Ibid, A III, No. 178. In later years the cordiality between the S.P.G. and this organization in New England disappeared as the leaders of the latter society became interested in placing Congregational ministers in "unorthodox" towns. In some of these the S.P.G. was already at work.

11. The religious situation in Rhode Island at this time is described in a memorial sent by Honeyman to Nicholson. It is called a "Melancholy Scene," the people divided into many sects and presenting "a dismal view of the Triumph of the Empire of darkness over the Kingdom of Our Lord Jesus." Among these are 1.)Quakers, 2.) Anabaptists divided between those observing the first and those the seventh day of the week, 3.)Cortonians, 4.)those living with no religion at all, 5.)Independents and a few members of the 6.)Church of England. S.P.G. Papers, B I, No. 176.

12. Bray to Sec'y, 24 May, 1704, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No.164; Church at Newport to the Sec'y, 29 Sept. 1702. Ibid, A I, No. 54;

J. Brenton to the Sec'y, 15 Nov. 1710, Ibid, A VI, No. 6.

13. Pascoe, 200 Years of the S.P.G., 42; J. Brenton to the Sec'y, 15 Nov., 1710, S.P.G. Letters, A VI, No. 6.

14. S.P.G. Journal, I, 29, 27 Feb. 1701/02; S. Myles to Bp. of Glouc., 8 July 1702, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 32; Bp. of London to the Sec'y, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 35.

15. Cuy to the Sec'y, 10 June 1717, S.P.G. Letters, A XII, 447--448; Shute to the Sec'y, 14 June 1717, Ibid, A XII, 449.

16. Humphreys, Hist. Acc't of the S.P.G., 323; Johnson's Rep., 18 Jan. 1722/23, S.P.G.Letters, A XVI42--44 et alia; Sec'y to Ch. at Prov., 20 July, 1723, Ibid, A XVII, 394--395; Sec'y to Pigot, 20 July 1723, Ibid, A XVII, 397; Pigot to the Sec'y, 13 Jan. 1723/24, Ibid, A XVII, 362--365.

17. "Their good will to ye Church se'ms mostly to [be] from their aversion to Independency & so secure themselves agt ye penal Laws of ye province of ye Massachusets Bay wch exacts a maintenance for ye Dissentg (or the Established Clergy as they call them) not only from dissenters of all Denominations, but from ye profess'd & actual members of ye Church of Engld & that too where they have a Minr of their own to help to Support." McSparran to the Sec'y, 7 Jan. 1723/24, S.P.G. Letters, A XVII, 359--362. Also Bridger to Lucas, 7 Oct. 1718, Ibid, A XIII, 521--523; Pigot to the Sec'y, 13 Jan. 1713/14, Ibid, A XVII, 362--365.

18. Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., I, xxvi; Bp. of London to the Sec'y, 19 Feb. 1702/3, S.P.G.Letters, A I, No. 53.

19. Keith's Journal, 22, 23. 27 and 30 Aug. 1702; Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., I, xv; Samuel Myles to the Bp. of Glouc., 8 July, 1702, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 32; Bp. of London to the

Sec'y, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 35; Keith to the Sec'y, 29 Nov. 1702, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 50.

20. Myles to Bp. of Glouc., 8 July 1702, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 32; John Brown to Abp of Canterbury, 23 Feb. 1703/04, Ibid, A I, No. 158; Myles to Dr. Beveridge, 26 Feb. 1703/04, Ibid, A I, No. 160; Myles to the Sec'y, 15 Aug. 1707, Ibid, A III, No. 123; Myles to the Sec'y, 16 Dec. 1708, Perry, Ch. Docs, Mass., 83.

21. S.P.G. Journal, I, 150, 156, 16 June 1704.

22. Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., I, xv.

23. Adams, Hist. of Quincy, 37.

24. C. Bridge to G. Keith, 19 Nov. 1702, S.P.G. Letters, A.I, No. 49; Myles to Bp. of Glouc., 8 July 1702, Ibid, A I, No.32; Lewis Morris to Archdeacon Beveridge, 27 July 1702, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 72--73; Bp. of London to the Sec'y, 19 Feb. 1702/03, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 53.

25. Talbot to the Sec'y, 7 April 1704, Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., I, xlii; Bp. of London to the Com., 13 May 1704, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 156.

26. Adams, Hist. of Quincy, 29--33, 42; Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I, 147.

27. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 84--85. The belief of the Episcopal party was that the attempt made to divide the town had as its purpose the prevention of a Church of England minister's coming to the place. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 91--93, 95; Pres. Leverett to the Sec'y, 1 Nov. 1711, S.P.G. Letters, A VI, No. 156.

28. Bp. of London to Myles, 14 Feb. 1705, Fulham Mss., R.I.

29. Myles to the Sec'y, 16 Dec. 1708, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 83; Colman to White Kennett, Nov. 1712, Turell, Colman, 124;

Pres. Leverett to the Sec'y, 1 Nov. 1711, S.P.G. Letters, A VI, No. 156.

30. Honeyman to the Sec'y, 27 Oct. 1709, S.P.G. Letters, A V, No. 54; Honeyman to the Sec'y, 6 Nov. 1710, Ibid, A VI, No. 7.

31. Bristol Sessions, II, 131, 132.

32. Ibid, II, 136, 140, 141.

33. Ibid, II, 214.

34. Humphreys, Hist. Acc't of the S.P.G., 62; "Memorial concerning Braintree", 9 Dec. 1713, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 95.

35. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 129.

36. Honeyman to the Sec'y, 12 July 1711, S.P.G. Letters, A VI, No. 106; Honeyman to Nicholson, 3 Dec. 1714, Ibid, A X, 278--279; Honeyman to the Sec'y, 4 Jan. 1714/15, Ibid, A X, 279; Honeyman to the Sec'y, 16 Sept 1715, Ibid, A XI, 381--382.

37. Dudley to the Bp. of London, 19 Dec. 1712, S.P.G. Papers, B I, No. 127; Ibid, B I, No. 164.

38. S.P.G. Papers, B I, No. 164; Braintree to Nicholson, 11 Dec. 1713, Ibid, B I, No. 168; Sir Chas. Hobby to the Sec'y, 11 Dec. 1713, S.P.G. Letters, A VIII, 529--530.

39. Nicholson to the Sec'y, 1 Dec. 1713, S.P.G. Letters, A VIII, 526--527; Same to same, 11 May 1714, S.P.G. Papers, BI, No. 178.

40. S.P.G. Journal, II, 369, 30 Mar. 1714.

41. Honeyman to the Sec'y, 3 Oct. 1715, S.P.G. Letters, A XI, 383.

42. Sec'y to Honeyman, 23 Apr. [1716], S.P.G. Letters, A XI, 417.

43. Shute to the Sec'y, 14 June 1717, Ibid, A XII, 449.

44. Honeyman to the Sec'y, 26 Aug. 1718, Ibid, A XIII, 519--

18 Oct. 1718.

520 et alia; Honeyman to the Sec'y, Ibid, A XIII, 530--532et alia.

45. McSparran to the Sec'y, 24 May 1721, Ibid, A XV, 127--129; McSparran to Nicholson, 26 May 1721, Ibid, A XV, 131; Bristol to the Society, 30 May 1721, Ibid, A XV, 132--133; Bristol to the Society, 8 Dec. 1721, Ibid, A XV, 152--153; Honeyman to the Sec'y, 15 Mar. 1721/22, Ibid, A XVI, 273--275; et alia.

46. Bristol to the Society, 4 June 1722, Ibid, A XVI, 275--276; Orem to the Sec'y, 4 July 1722, Ibid, A XVI, 292--296; Orem to the Sec'y, 30 Oct. 1722, Ibid, A XVI, 314--315. James McSparren of Narragansett who helped supply the Bristol parish at Orem's departure wrote, "the 3 Towns now menc̄oned [Freetown, Tiverton and Little Compton] have each of them a few (&but a few people that incline to ye Ch: of Eng d but have hitherto made no advances towds having the Worship of God accordg to yt way setled among them, Save that ye building of Bristol Church." McSparren to the Sec'y, 1May 1723, Ibid, A XVII, 342--345.

47. Usher to the Sec'y, 27 Dec. 1726, Ibid, A XIX, 459--460; Pigot to the Sec'y, 11 Sept. 1727, S.P.G. Papers, B I, No.223.

48. Honeyman to the Sec'y, 10 April 1728, S.P.G. Letters, A XXI, 403--404; Honeyman to the Sec'y, 6 July 1731, Ibid, A XXIII, 251--252; Honeyman to the Sec'y, 27 Nov. 1734, Ibid, A XXV, 159.

49--50. Checkley to Thos. Bennet, 15 June 1725, Slafter, Checkley, II, 174--175; Cutler to the Sec'y, 23 Sept. 1725, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 184--185.

51. Braintree to Nicholson, 28 Dec., 1726, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 208--209.

52. Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I, 259.

53. Miller to the Sec'y, 25 May 1729, S.P.G. Letters, A XXII,

163--164; Same to same, 5 Oct. 1732, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 289--290; Cutler to the Sec'y, 29 Nov. 1732, S.P.G. Letters, A XXIV, 97--98; S.P.G. Abstract, 1728--1729, 47.

54. Miller to the Sec'y, 5 Dec., 1732, S.P.G.Letters, A XXIV, 154.

55. Petition from people of Scituate, 30 Nov. 1732, Ibid, A XXIV, 160--;61.

56. Davenport to the Sec'y, 10 Nov. 1735, Ibid, A XXV, 324--328.

57. Davenport to the Sec'y, 3 Nov. 1733,Ibid,A XXIV, 431.

58. Cutler to the Sec'y, 9 Nov. 1734, Ibid,A XXV,154--155.

59. Miller to the Sec'y, 26 Dec. 1734. Ibid, A XXV, 168.

60. Talbot to the Sec'y, 13 Dec. 1707, Ibid, A III, No.158.

61. Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., I,61; Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 113; Marblehead to the Society, 5 April 1714, S.P.G. Papers, B I, No. 171; Marblehead to Nicholson, 5 April 1714, Ibid, B I, No. 172. In referring to this letter Nicholson wrote, "The town of Marblehead is...one of the most thriving in the Country, by reason of the Fishing Trade--very many Ships loading there with dry Cod fish for Portugall Spain and the Streights; If the Society would be pleased to send a good Missionary thither & that as soon as possible I beleive there would be a very considerable Congregation of the Church of England." 11 May 1714,Ibid, B I, No. 178; Myles to the Sec'y, 23 July 1714, Ibid, B.I. No. 188.

62. Shaw to the Sec'y, 13 Jan. 1715/16, Ibid, A XI,385--386.

63. Pigot to the Sec'y, 29 Apr. 1728, Ibid, A XXI, 405; Pet. of Salem to the Society, 1 Aug. 1733, Ibid, A XXIV, 417--418; Salem to the Society, 30 Dec. 1734, Ibid, A XXV, 171--172; Mass. Archives XI, 413.

64. Pigot to the Sec'y, 6 Aug. 1733, S.P.G. Letters, A XXIV, 419.

65. Plant to the Sec'y, 24 Sept. 1732, Ibid, A XXIV, 139--140; Pigot to the Sec'y, 29 Oct. 1733, Ibid, A XXIV, 426; Plant to the Sec'y, 6 Dec. 1734, Ibid, A XXV, 162.

66. Coffin, Hist. of Newbury, 151 et seq.; Currier, Ould Newbury, 363--395; Currier, Hist. of Newbury, Mass., 332--357; 369--374; "Mem. of John Bridger", 4 Dec. 1711, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 99; Pet. of Newbury to the Bp. of London, S.P.G. Letters, A VII, 93; Bp. of London to the Sec'y, 4 Feb. 1712/13, Ibid, A VII, 45; et alia.

67. "Mem. of John Bridger," 4 Dec. 1711, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 99; Bridger to Lord Dartmouth, 2 Feb. 1711/12, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 102; Lucas to the Sec'y, 19 June 1720, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 132; "But they chuse the Church because they would save their Rates to the other Ministers is very plaine to me." Bridger to Lucas, 7 Oct. 1718, S.P.G. Letters, A XIII, 521--523.

68. Lucas to the Sec'y, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 127.

69. Colman Stated that while Belcher of the West Precinct of Newbury was a man of unusually catholic principles, the people of Queen Anne's Chapel were "till now among the most narrow and rigid Dissenters, who would before this have disowned me in particular, for the Use of the Lord's Prayer, reading the Scriptures and a freer Admission to the Lord's Table, than has been generally practiced in these Churches." Colman to White Kennett, Nov. 1712, Turell, Colman, 124.

70. "Account of the State of the Church in North America by Mr. George Keith and others." Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls.,I,xv.

71. Documents relating to the case are in the Public Record Office. C.O. 5, 863.

72. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 84--85.

73. Perry, Ibid, Mass., 99--108; Sewall's Diary, 27 Feb. 1711/12.

74. "Minutes of the S.P.C.K.", McClure, Eng. Ch. Hist., 140, 299, 306.

75. S.P.G. Journal, I, 37, 43.

76. Keith to the Sec'y, S.P.G. Letters, A I, No. 9; Dudley to the Sec'y, 10 Oct. 1706. Ibid, A III, No. 4; S.P.G. Journal, 18 Jan. 1711/12, II, 153.

77. Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, 147, 175; Kimball Dudley.

78. Dudley described the situation in Massachusetts from his own point of view in a letter to the Bishop of London, dated Aug. 1, 1705, Fulham Mss., Mass.

79. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 108.

80. Dudley to the Bp. of London, 19 Dec. 1712, S.P.G. Papers, B I, No. 127; Dudley to the Sec'y, 1 May 1714, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 97; Pascoe, Digest of the S.P.G., 43.

81. Dudley to the Bp. of London, 19 Dec. 1712, S.P.G. Papers, B I, No. 127.

82. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 109.

83. Prot. Episc. Hist. Soc. Colls., I, xxiii, xxv, xxxiii; S.P.G. Sermon and proceedings, 1712--13, 42; Lambton to Nicholson, 1 Jan. 1713/14, 27 Jan. 1713/14, 3 Feb. 1713/14, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 87, 88, 89. There is also a petition from Newbury to the Queen preserved in the Public Record Office, C.O. 5, 751. This petition was covered by Bridger with a letter to the secretary of the Board of Trade dated 7 Dec. 1713.

84. Nicholson to the Sec'y, 17 Feb. 1713/14, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 91.

85. Quoted from the records of Newbury in Currier, Ould Newbury, 383. In this order Quakers were also included. The account of his travels in America submitted by James Dickenson to the London Yearly Meeting of 1715 records that "at Boston they had large meetings and Service. and also at Newberry where friends as well as the Church of England People (so called) are Exempted from paying to the National Presbyterian Priests there." Lond. Yr.M., V, 134.

86. Isaac Addington to Wm. Vesey, 23 Apr. 1713, Fulham Mss., Mass.

87. Council Minutes, 7 May 1713, Fulham Mss., Mass.

88. "The Case of the Church of Brantry," 2 June 1713, Ibid; Sewall's Diary, 2 June 1713.

89. Wm. Tailer to Wm. Vesey, 19 June 1713, Fulham Mss., Mass.

90. Eager to the Sec'y, 12 Aug. 1713, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 91--93.

91. Sec'y to Eager, 18 Dec. 1713, S.P.G.Letters, A VIII,588.

92. Perry, Ch. Docs. Mass., 96.

93. The secretary referred to the following statement.-- "Those that brought me, that address, carry'd Home with them Immediately an order under my Hand Commanding that nothing upon any pretence whatsoever Should be taken from any of them that Declar'd for the Church of England, for the Maintenance of any other Minister." Dudley to the Bp. of London, 19 Dec. 1712, S.P.G.Papers,B I, No.127.

94. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 97.

95. Ministers etc. of the Ch. of Eng. in Boston to the Bp.of London, 29 Sept. 1714, Fulham Mss., Mass; Sec'y to Tailer, 17 Dec. 1716, S.P.G. Letters, A XI, 421.

96. The appointment of Shute was a matter of satisfaction to New England Congregationalists until they discovered his policy. Cotton Mather to Lord Barrington, 4 Nov. 1718, 1 Mass. Hist. Colls., I, 105, 106; "Address to His Majesty from the Convention of the Ministers of Christ in New England," 30 May 1717, C.O.5, 752.

97. S.P.G. Journal, IV, 49, 15 May 1719.

98. Shute to the Sec'y, 1 Jan. 1718/19, S.P.G. Letters, A XIII, 547.

99. Marblehead to the Sec'y, 10 May 1717, Perry, Ch. Docs. Mass., 126--127; Shute to the Sec'y, 10 May 1717, S.P.G. Letters, A XII, 442; Sec'y to Shute, 16 Dec. 1717, Ibid, A XII, 473; Marblehead to the Sec'y, Feb. 1717/18, Ibid, A XIII, 498.

100. Shaw to the Sec'y, 31 Mar. 1718, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 130.

101. Mossom to the Sec'y, 17 Apr. 1719, S.P.G. Letters, A XIII, 548; Same to same, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 134--135.

102. Sec'y to Shute, 27 Aug. 1718, S.P.G. Letters, A XIII, 544--545.

103. Mossom to the Sec'y, 11 June 1722, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 137.

104. Petition printed in Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 139.

105. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 140; Mossom to the Bp. of London, 28 Apr. 1724, Fulham Mss., Mass; Slafter, Checkley, I, 79note.

106. Order in full from Records of Queen Anne's Chapel, printed in Currier, Ould Newbury, 383.

107. Plant to the Sec'y, 20 Dec. 1726, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 207; Slafter, Checkley, II, 33.

108. Mossem and Orem to the Bp. of London, Fulham Mss., Mass.; petition printed in Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 140.

109. Plant to the Sec'y, 7 Sept. 1726, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 203.

110. Updike, Narragansett Church, II, 469, quoting Records of St. Paul's Church, Narragansett; Munro, Hist. of Bristol, 140.

111. Bristol to the Bp. of London, 8 Jan. 1721/22, S.P.G. Letters, A XVI, 269--273; Bristol to the S.P.G., 29 Oct. 1722, Ibid, A XVI, 306--309.

112. Mossom to the Bp. of London, 28 Apr. 1724, Fulham Mss., Mass. Orem brought to Dummer a petition from the imprisoned Churchmen of Bristol. Munro, Hist. of Bristol, 141 quoting New England Courant, 11 Feb. 1722/23; Updike, Narragansett Church, II, 469, quoting Records of St. Paul's Church, Narragansett.

113. Fulham Mss., Mass.

114. Cutler to Gov. and Council, 24 Apr. 1724, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 144.

115. Myles to the Bp. of London, 1 June 1724, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 153--154; Cross, Ang. Episc, 65--66.

116. S.P.G. Journal, IV, 310--311, 19 June 1724.

117. Ibid, IV, 312--313, 17 July 1724. The authority used by the S.P.G. was a compilation of "Laws relating to the Church and Clergy in America," which had been submitted to the Society in 1720 and published upon its order. Ibid, IV, 104,105, 8 &29 Apr. 1720.

118. S.P.G. Journal, V, 70, 17 Dec. 1725; Sec'y to Mossom, 3 Jan. 1725/26, S.P.G. Letters, A XIX, 270--271.

119. See the Mossom correspondence on Shute's Marblehead order, Sec'y to Mossom, 25 Aug. 1724, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 165; S.P.G. Journal, IV, 310--311, 312--313, 317, 19 June, 17 July, 21 Aug. 1724; Ibid, V, 61, 19 Nov. 1725, quoting a letter from Mossom

to the Sec'y, 16 Dec. 1724; Mossom to the Bp. of London, 7 Jan. 1725/26, Fulham Mss., Mass.

120. Cross, Ang. Episc., 67--76; Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 170--190.

121. The two sides of the argument over what was in point of law the Established church of Massachusetts appears in numerous writings from the time of the province charter. The clearest statements are by John Checkley and Benjamin Colman. The stand taken by the former is that the Church of England was extended as an established church to the colonies by the Act of Union. Colman's argument is that the King in Council by sanctioning Massachusetts ecclesiastical laws had recognized the Congregational as the established church of Massachusetts. Checkley to Z. Grey, 28 Jan. 1725/26, Slafter, Checkley, II, 221; Checkley to T. Bennett, 15 June 1725, Ibid, II, 175; Colman to White Kennett, 17 Dec. 1725, Turell, Colman, 137.

122. Chas. Delafaye to the Gov.of N.E. by order of the Lords Justices, 7 Oct. 1725, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 189.

123. S.P.G. Journal, V, 99, 16 Sept. 1726.

124. Ibid, V, 101, 21 Oct. 1726.

125. Ibid, V, 109, 20 Jan. 1726/27.

126. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 202; Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 477; Acts of the Privy Council, III, 156.

127. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 481. This petition is printed in full in Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 478--481.

128. As English lawyers later observed there was at this point a confusion. If the laws were repugnant to the charter no repeal in the legislature was needed but a test case carried to England, resulting in annulment. If they were not repugnant to the

charter they could not be repealed without the consent of the General Court as they had already received the royal approbation.

129. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 481--482; Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I, 453; Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 202.

130. Updike, Narragansett Church, 477, quoting Records of St. Paul's Church, Narragansett; Providence to the Sec'y, 12 May 1725, S.P.G. Letters, A XIX, 228--229.

131. N.E. Hist. & Gen. Reg., XXXV, 163.

132. Mossom to the Bp. of London, 7 Jan. 1725/26, Fulham Mss., Mass.

133. Dummer to the [Bp. of London], 15 Nov. 1725, Ibid; Harris and Mossom to the Bp. of London, 7 Dec. 1725, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 200; Mossom to the Bp. of London, 7 Jan. 1725/26, Fulham Mss., Mass.

134. Plant to the Sec'y, 20 Dec. 1726, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 207.

135. Ibid, 206; Dummer to Plant, 12 Dec. 1726, Ibid, 205.

136. Plant to the Sec'y, 20 Dec. 1726, Ibid, 207.

137. Dummer to Quincy, 7 Apr. 1727, Mass. Archives, XI, 419.

138. Plant to the Sec'y, 20 Dec. 1726, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 207.

139. Braintree to Nicholson, 28 Dec. 1726, Fulham Mss., Mass.

140. Cutler to the Sec'y, 24 May 1727, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 222; Dummer to the Bp. of London, 20 June 1727, Fulham Mss., Mass.

141. Pubs. of the Col. Soc. of Mass., I, Transactions, 142. Jonathan Belcher who was a member of the Council at this time later stated that he did all in his power to promote it. Belcher

to the Bp. of London, 5 Oct. 1738, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass.,292--293.

142. Mass. Archives, XI, 472.

143. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 459, ch. 7.

144. Cutler to Capt. John Delapp, 13 May 1731, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 264--266.

145. Providence to the Sec'y, 8 July 1730, S.P.G. Letters, A XXIII, 118--119; a petition in behalf of these people was read by the Governor's Council, 5 Sept. 1728, C.O. 5, 898.

146. Checkley to the Bp. of London, 31 Mar. 1728, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 250; Miller to the Bp. of London, 10 May 1728, Ibid, 253.

147. S.P.G. Journal, V, 164, 21 June 1728.

148. "As to the two acts about the Lords day, and exempting church men &c I think them both very wrong, and wish they were repealed by His Majesty I beleive it would have a good effect if they were so, and the objectionsmentioned by your Lordship against ym seem to be all well founded. and I wish they could be taught to know that the Independents here are no Established church." Burnet to the Bp. of London, 27 Nov. 1728, Fulham Mss., Mass.

149. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 482.

150. Cutler to Capt. John Delapp, 13 May 1731, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 264--266.

151. Acts of the P.C., III, 156.

152. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 482--483; Acts of the P.C., III, 156; Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I, 455.

153. This petition is given in full in Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 483, and in Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I, 454.

154. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 483--484.

155. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 272--273; Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, 455.

156. C.O.5, 916, 306--307, 30 Mar. 1729/30.

157. Belcher 's answer to Cutler's address to the governor, Boston Gazette, 10--17 Aug. 1730; Belcher to the Duke of Grafton, 12 Dec. 1730, Fulham Mss., Mass.; Price to the Bp. of London, Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 272; Belcher to the Bp. of London, 4 Dec. 1731, 6 Mass. Hist. Colls., VI, 72--73; Belcher to Richard Partridge, 27 Apr. 1732, Ibid, VI, 123.

158. Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I, 456--457, quoting the Records of Christ Church.

159. Updike, Narragansett Church, II, 504--505, quoting Records of the Narragansett Church, The Narragansett Church pledged 28 pounds, 15 shillings.

160. Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I,457--459, quoting the Records of King's Chapel and of Christ Church.

161. Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 274--288.

162. Bp. of London to Price, 6 Feb. 1732/33, Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I, 461.

163. Petition of the Massachusetts Churchmen to the Archbp. of Canterbury, Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, I, 464.

164. Ibid, quoting Records of King's Chapel and of Christ Church.

165. Foote, Annals of King's Chapel, 464, 465, 467; Perry, Ch. Docs., Mass., 311--312.

166. Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 782; ch. 15, 27 Dec. 1735.

167. Sharpe to the Bp. of London, 10 Jan 1735/36, Fulham Mss., Mass.

168. Acts of the Privy Council, III, 491--492; Mass. Prov. Laws, II, 635.

169. Mass. Prov. Laws, III, 25, ch. 8, 1 July 1742.

CONCLUSION

The conflict between Dissenter and Anglican was one of the most interesting features of colonial history in the early eighteenth century. In England and her colonies the Dissenters were almost entirely included in the four great bodies of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and Quakers. Severally these represented a very unequal opposition to Episcopacy. In England the Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists, who could have shown considerable strength if united, were not able to find a common platform and were all torn by internal theological controversy. The great men of the first generation had not been followed by others of so high a degree of eminence, and many of the prominent nonconformists returned to the Anglican Church either at the failure of the Comprehension bill or later when the Occassional Conformity act was passed. At home therefore they were less vigorous than formerly and disunited; they failed likewise to maintain a close connection with their followers in America. The Quakers of England on the other hand were strongly organized and so closely bound to the meetings which had been established throughout the colonies that they were ready to support them in every way. It is for this reason that the aggression of the Church of England in the colonies during the early provincial period was met by the Quakers as the organized leaders of the dissenting interests. The variation of this general principle found in Massachusetts was due to the nature of the early founding of Plymouth and the Bay Colony. In spite of a lack of sympathy at

this time from the Presbyterians and Independents of England, the Congregational Church had here established a system so strong that it was long able to defy both of the great organized religious bodies, the Church of England and the Society of Friends. Resistance to this structure was begun, first by the Quakers, here supported by the Baptists, and then by the Anglicans, when the latter, at the founding of the S.P.G. began to spread through the Quaker and later through the orthodox settlements of the province. Success for both was assured through the efforts of the parent bodies in England, working with the tendencies of the times which were moving slowly toward religious liberty. The Episcopal Church was hindered however by the very power which would naturally be forwarding the interests of the state church, namely, the British government. Since the Anglicans failed to push matters during the ascendency of the high church party, the final success was reached only after numerous rebuffs at the hands of Walpole and the Duke of Newcastle. The Whigs were inclined to display a significant apathy when approached on questions which were of vital interest chiefly to the Bishop of London and the Venerable Society.

END

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Guides and Bibliographies.

Allison, William Henry, Inventory of unpublished material for American religious history in protestant church archives and other repositories. Washington, 1910.

Andrews, Charles M., Guide to the materials for American history to 178[illegible], in the Public Record Office of Great Britain. Vol. I. Washington, 1912.

Andrews, Charles M., and Frances G. Davenport, Guide to the manuscript materials for the history of the United States to 1783, in the British Museum, in minor London archives, and in the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge. Washington, 1908.

Flagg, Charles Allcott, A guide to Massachusetts local history, being a bibliographic index to the literature of the towns, cities and counties of the state. Salem, Mass., 1907.

Ford, W. C., A bibliography of the Massachusetts house journals, 1715--1776. Cambridge, Mass., 1905.

Massachusetts, Report of the committee on the custody and condition of the public records of parishes, towns and counties, by Carroll D. Wright. Boston, 1889.

Rhode Island Historical Society. A bibliography of Rhode Island local history.

Sabin, Joseph, A dictionary of books relating to America, 19 vols. New York, 1862--1892.

Smith, Joseph, Bibliotheca Quakeristica, a bibliography of miscellaneous literature relating to the Friends. London, 1883.

Manuscripts.

Public Record Office, London.

Board of Trade Papers.

Original Correspondence, Massachusetts Bay.

C. O. 5, 751--752. 1689--1740.

Original Correspondence, New England, Board of Trade.

C. O. 5, 855--881. 1689--1740.

Original Correspondence, New England, Secretary of State.

C. O. 5, 898--899. 1703--1741.

Entry Books, New England.

C. O. 5, 905--917. 1688--1741.

Journal of the Board of Trade.

C. O. 391, 7--48. 1691--1740.

C. O. 391, 90--119. 1696--1735.

Privy Council Office, London.

Privy Council Register, 1696--1765.

Fulham Palace, London.

Papers of the Bishop of London.

New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island.

(One box of papers.)

Massachusetts.

(Two boxes of papers.)

S. P. G. House, London.

S. P. G. Letters. (A. Mss.), 1701--1736, contemporary copies, 26 vols.

S. P. G. Papers. (B. Mss.), 1701--1786, original letters and miscellaneous documents, 6 vols.

S. P. G. Journals, 1701 et seq.

Devonshire House, London.

Minutes of the London Yearly Meeting. Vols. I--VII. 1668--1770.

Minutes of the London Meeting for Sufferings. Vols. XI--XXVII. 1696--1745.

Epistles Received. Vol. I. 1683--1706. Vol. II. 1705--1738.

Epistles Sent. Vol. I. 1683--1703. Vol. II. 1704--1738. Vol. III. 1738--1756.

Book of Cases. Vol. II. 1695--1738.

Kelsall Diaries.

Moses Brown School, Providence, R. I.

Records of the New England Yearly Meeting. Vol. I. 1683--1786.

Records of the quarterly and monthly meetings of Massachusetts are preserved in the following places:-

R. I. Quarterly, vol. I. 1701--1746, with record of sufferings (1688--1720). Moses Brown School, Providence, R. I.

Sandwich Quarterly, vol. I. 1706--1777. Friends' Meeting House, New Bedford, Mass.

Salem Quarterly, vol. I. 1706--1712, vol. II. 1727--1799. Friends' Meeting House, Lynn, Mass.

R. I. Monthly, vol. I. 1676--1708, vol. II. 1708--1739 Newport Historical Society, Newport, R. I.

Dartmouth Monthly, 1699--1770, (transcript). Friends' Meeting House, New Bedford, Mass.

Sandwich Monthly, 1672--1754, including sufferings in "latter end" of book. Friends' Meeting House, New Bedford, Mass.

Pembroke Monthly, 1701--1741. Friends' Meeting House, New Bedford, Mass.

Salem Monthly, 1677--1731, including sufferings. Friends' Meeting House, Lynn, Mass.

State House, Boston.

Massachusetts Archives.

Executive Records of the Council.

Legislative Records of the Council.

Boston Public Library.

Miscellaneous Manuscripts.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

Miscellaneous Manuscripts.

New England Baptist Historical Society, Boston.

Isaac Backus Papers.

Essex Institute, Salem, Mass.

Diary of Z. Collins, 1727--1768.

Rhode Island Historical Society, Providence, R. I.

Isaac Backus Papers.

Moses Brown Papers.

Newport Historical Society, Newport, R. I.

Letter Book of Thomas Richardson, 2 vols. 1710--1719.

Bristol County Court House, Taunton, Mass.

Records of the general sessions of the Peace for the County of Bristol, 3 vols. 1702--1738.

Printed Sources.

Andros Tracts; with notes and memoir, edited by W. H. Whitmore, 3 vols. Prince Society Publications. Boston, 1868--1874.

Chalmers, George, Opinions of eminent lawyers on various points of English jurisprudence, chiefly concerning the colonies. Burlington, Vt., 1858.

Great Britain, Calendar of state papers, colonial series, America and the West Indies,--1702. London, 1860--1912.

Hutchinson, Thomas, Collection of papers. Prince Society Publications, 2 vols. Albany, N. Y., 1865.

Massachusetts. The acts and resolves, public and private, of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay, 18 vols. Boston, 1869--1912.

Massachusetts. Journals, proceedings and debates of the House of Representatives of his majesty's province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England. Boston and Watertown, 1715--1777.

Massachusetts Historical Society Collections.

Diary of Samuel Sewall. Series 5, V-VII.

Letter Book of Samuel Sewall. Series 6, I-II.

Diary of Cotton Mather. Series 7, VII.

Mather Papers. Series 4, VIII.

Hinckley Papers. Series 4, V.

Belcher Papers. Series 6, VI-VII.

Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings.

New England Historic and Genealogical Register.

Old Dartmouth Historical Society Collections.

Perry, William Stevens, Papers relating to the history of the Church in Massachusetts, 1676--1785. New York, 1873.

Privy Council, Acts of the, 3 vols. London, 1908--1912.

Quakers. Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in London, to the quarterly and monthly meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and elsewhere, from 1681 to 1817 inclusive London, 1818.

Protestant Episcopal Historical Society Collections, 2 vols. New York, 1851--1853.

Rhode Island Historical Society Collections, 10 vols.

Diary of John Comer. VIII.

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. A chapter in English church history: being the minutes of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, for the years 1698--1704. Edited by Edmund Mc Clure. London, 1888.

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. Some correspondence between the governors and treasurers of the New England Company in London and the commissioners of the United Colonies in America, the missionaries of the company and others between the years 1657 and 1712, edited by J. W. Ford. London, 1896.

Contemporary Books, Pamphlets, etc.

Bownas, Samuel, An account of the life, travels, and Christian experiences in the work of the ministry of Samuel Bownas, with a preface by Joseph Besse. London, 1759.

Calamy, Edmund, An abridgement of Mr. Baxter's history of his life and times, 2vols. London, 1713.

Calamy, Edmund, Protestant dissenters in England. London, 1736.

Chalkley, Thomas, A journal of the life, labours, travels, etc. of Thomas Chalkley. Philadelphia, 1790.

Chalkley, Thomas, Forcing a maintenance, not warantable from the holy scripture, for a minister of the gospel. 1713.

Dickenson, James, A journal of the life, travels, and labour of love in the work of the ministry of that worthy elder, and faithful servant of Jesus Christ, James Dickenson. London, 1745.

Edmundson, William, Journal of the life, travels and sufferings of labour and love in the work of the ministry of William Edmundson. London, 1774.

Fothergill, John, Life and travels of John Fothergill. London, 1753.

Honeyman, James, Faults on all sides. The case of religion consider'd. Newport, 1728.

Humphreys, David, An historical account of the incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. London, 1730.

Keith, George, A journal of travels from New Hampshire to Caratuck, on the continent of North America. London, 1706.

Mather, Cotton, Magnalia Christi Americana; or, the ecclesiastical history of New England from...1620 unto 1698...with notes by Rev. Thomas Robbins and memoir by S.G. Drake, 2 vols. Hartford, Conn., 1855.

Mather, Cotton, Ratio Disciplinae fratrum Novanglorum. A faithful account of the discipline professed and practiced in the churches of New England. Boston, 1726.

Mather, Increase, Discourse concerning the maintenance due to those that preach the gospel. Boston, 1706.

Mather, Increase, The excellency of a publick spirit discoursed: in a sermon, preached in the audience of the General Assembly of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, May 27, 1702. Boston, 1702.

Mather, Increase, The great blessing of primitive counsellours. Boston.

Neal, Daniel, The history of New-England containing an impartial account of the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of the country to 1700, 2 vols. London, 1747.

Oldmixon, John, The British empire in America, containing the history of the discovery, settlement, progress and present state of all the British colonies on the continent and islands of America, 2 vols. London, 1708.

Papers relating to the Quakers' Tythe Bill. London, 1736.

Richardson John, Account of the life of that ancient servant of Jesus Christ, John Richardson. London, 1774.

Sewel, William, History of the rise, increase and progress of

the Christian people called Quakers, 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1728.

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Abstracts of the proceedings of the sociery appendedto the sermon preached at the annual meetings held at the parish church of St. Mary- le- Bow, 1701--1740, passim.

Society for the Propagation of the Cospel in Foreign Parts. An account of the society. London, 1706.

The laws of the British plantations in America relating to the church and clergy, religion and learning. London, 1721.

General and special Histories, etc.

Adams, Brooks, The emancipation of Massachusetts. Boston and New York, 1887.

Adams, Charles Francis, Massachusetts; its historians and its history, Boston, 1893.

Adams, Charles Francis, Three episodes of Massachusetts history, 2 vols. Boston, 1892.

Allen, W. O. B., and Edmund Mc Clure, Two hundred years: The history of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698--1898. London, 1898.

Anderson, J. S. M., History of the Church of England in the colonies, 3 vols. London, 1848.

Armitage, Thomas, A history of the Baptists; traced by their vital principles. New York, 1887.

Backus, Isaac, A history of New England. With particular reference to the denonination of Christians called Baptists, with

notes by David Weston, 2 vols. Newton, Mass., 1871.

Biographical Catalogue, being an account of the lives of Friends and others whose portraits are in the London Friends Institute. London, 1888.

Bowden, James, The history of the Society of Friends in America, 2 vols. London, 1850--1854.

Buck, Edward, Massachusetts ecclesiastical law. Boston, 1866.

Burrage, Henry S., History of the Baptists in New England. Philadelphia, 1894.

Channing, Edward, Town and county government in the English colonies of North America. Johns Hopkins University Studies, vol. II, No. 10.

Cobb, Sanford H., Rise of religious liberty in America. New York, 1902.

Colonial Society of Massachusetts Publications. Vol. I. Transactions. Boston, 1895.

Cross, Arthur L., The Anglican Episcopate and the American colonies. Harvard Historical Studies, 1902.

Dale, R. W., History of English Congregationalism. London, 1907.

Dickerson, O. M., American colonial government, 1696--1765. Cleveland, 1912.

Drysdale, A. H., Presbyterians in England. London, 1889.

Foote, Henry W., Annals of King's Chapel from the Puritan age of New England to the present day, 2 vols. Boston, 1882.

Ford, David B., New England's struggle for religious liberty. Philadelphia, 1896.

Gough, John, History of the people called Quakers, 4 vols.

Dublin, 1789--1790.

Hallowell, Richard P., The pioneer Quakers. Boston, 1887.

Howard, George E, An introduction to the local constitutional history of the United States. Johns Hopkins University Studies, Baltimore, 1889.

Hutchinson, Thomas, History of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, 1691--1750, 3 vols. Boston, 1764--1828.

Hutton, William H., The English Church from the accession of Charles I to the death of Anne, 1625--1714. London, 1903.

Jones, Rufus M., The Quakers in the American colonies. London, 1911.

Kimball, Everett, The public life of Joseph Dudley. A study of the colonial policy of the Stuarts in NewEngland, 1660--1715. New York, 1911.

Lauer, P. E., Church and state in Ne w England. Johns Hopkins University Studies, Baltimore, 1883.

Lloyd, Walter, The story of protestant dissent and English unitarianism. London 1899.

Mc Connel, Samuel D., History of the American Episcopal Church. New York, 1899.

Marvin, A. P., Life and times of Cotton Mather. Boston, 1892.

Newman, A. H., History of the Baptist churches in America. New York, 1893.

Overton, John H., Life in the English Church, 1660--1714. London, 1885.

Overton, John H., and Frederic Relton, The English Church from the accession of George I to the end of the eighteenth century, 1714--1800. London, 1906.

Palfrey, John G., History of New England, 5 vols. Boston, 1860--1890.

Pascoe, C. F., Classified digest of the records of the S.P.G., 1701--1892. London, 1893.

Pascoe, C. F., Two hundred years of the S.P.G., 1701--1900. London, 1901.

Perry, William S., History of the American Episcopal Church, 2 vols. Boston, 1885.

Phillips, Sadler, The early English colonies. A summary of the lecture by the Right Hon. and Right Rev, Arthur Foley, Lord Bishop of London with additional notes and illustrations delivered at the Richmond Auditorium, Virginia, October 4, 1907. With a preface by the Bishop of London. London,,1908.

Quakers. A brief account of the yearly meeting of Friends for New-England, with the subordinate meetings of which it is composed. Providence, R.I., 1836.

Quincy, Josiah, The history of Harvard University, 2 vols. Boston, 1860.

Skeats, H. S., and Charles S. Miall, History of the Free Churches of England, 1688--1891. London, 1891.

Slafter, Edmund, John Checkley; or the evolution of religious tolerance in Massachusetts Bay, 1719--1774, 2 vols. Prince Society Publications. Boston, 1897.

Spencer, Henry R., Constitutional conflict in provincial Massachusetts; a study of some phases of the opposition between the Massachusetts governor and General Court in the early eighteenth century. Columbus, O., 1905.

Steiner, Bernard C., Rev. Thomas Bray. His life and selected

works relating to Maryland. Baltimore, 1901.

Thomas, Allen C.,and Richard H., History of the Society of Friends in America. New York, 1900.

Tiffany, Charles C., History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. New York, 1895.

Trumbull, Benjamin, A complete history of Connecticut, civil and ecclesiastical, 1630--1764, 2 vols. Hartford, Conn., 1818.

Turell, Ebenezer, The life and character of the Reverend Benjamin Colman, D.D. Boston, 1749.

Uhden, Hermann,F., Geschichte der Congregationalisten in New England bis 1740. English version by H. C. Conant, New England Theocracy. Boston, 1858.

Walker, Williston, Creeds and platforms of Congregationalism. New York, 1893.

Walker, Williston, History of the Congregational churches in the United States. New York, 1894.

Weeden, William B., Economic and social history of New England, 1620--1789, 2 vols. Boston, 1890.

Wendell, Barrett, Cotton Mather, the Puritan priest. New York, 1891.

Winsor, Justin, The memorial history of Boston, 1630--1880, 8 vols. Boston, 1884--1889.

Wood, Nathan E., The history of the First Baptist Church of Boston, 1665--1899. Philadelphia, 1899.

Local Histories.

Adams, Charles Francis, Jr., History of Quincy. Cambridge, 1891.

Bicknell, Thomas W., A History of Barrington, R. I. Providence, R.I., 1898.

Coffin, Joshua, A sketch of the history of Newbury, Newburyport, and West Newbury from 1635 to 1845. Boston, 1845.

Currier, John J., History of Newbury, Mass., 1635--1902. Boston, 1902.

Currier, John J., "Ould Newbury": historical and biographical sketches. Boston, 1896.

Daggett, John, A sketch of the history of Attleborough. Boston, 1894.

Ellis, Leonard B., History of New Bedford and its vicinity, 1602--1892. Syracuse, N.Y., 1892.

Fowler, Orin, History of Fall River, with notices of Freetown and Tiverton. Fall River, 1862.

Hurd, D.H., History of Bristol County, Massachusetts. Philadelphia, 1883.

Jenkins, Charles W., Early history of the town of Falmouth. Falmouth, Mass., 1889.

Little Compton, R.I. The 175th anniversary of the organization of the United Congregational Church of Little Compton, R.I. Providence, R.I., 1880. Also The 200th anniversary of its organization, September 7, 1904. 1906.

Munro, Wilfred H., The history of Bristol, R.I. Providence, R.I., 1880.

Potter, William J., The first congregational society in New Bedford, Mass.: its history as illustrative of ecclesiastical evolution. New Bedford, Mass., 1889.

Pratt, Ambrose E., 200th anniversary celebration of Sandwich and Bourne, 1889. Falmouth, Mass., 1890.

Thatcher, J.J., Historical sketch of the First Baptist Church, Swansea, Mass., 1663--1863. Fall River, Mass., 1863.

Updike, Wilkins, The Narragansett Church. Boston, 1907.

VITA.

I, Susan Martha Reed, was born in Roxbury, Massachusetts, August 16, 1884, and was prepared for college in the public schools of Westfield, Massachusetts. At Mount Holyoke College which I entered in 1903 I was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1907. I received the degree of Master of Arts in History from the University of Illinois in 1908 and during the two following years acted as assistant in European History at the same institution. In 1910--11 I completed my resident work for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Illinois, holding one of the university fellowships, and have since spent three months in England collecting material for the completion of this thesis. I have also substituted for a short time in American History at Mount Holyoke College.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 086859300